

Volume XVI.]

March, 1840.

[Number 10.]



THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND
WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,

Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.

VOLUME XVI.

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—Jer. vi. 16.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM S. YOUNG,
173, RACE STREET.

1839-40.

POSTAGE: Two sheets, 100 miles, 3 cents; any greater distance, 5 cents.



THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

THE

REIGN OF

THE

REIGN OF

THE

REIGN OF

THE

REIGN OF

THE

REIGN OF

THE

REIGN OF

AR

T

285

criti

very

to h

vio

vers

ap

Old

tion

it in

atio

and

thin

cit

is o

has

ins

the

gel

from

tak

the

eli

Te

len

and

qu

stan

from

qu

Ho

V

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MARCH, 1840.

ART. I.—*On the supposed Quotations of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament occurring in the New.*

THE Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was made about 285 years before the birth of Jesus Christ. It is thought by eminent critics to have been made from Hebrew manuscripts, which were very corrupt, by persons also who were not skilful in Hebrew; and to have been itself greatly corrupted by frequent transcription, previously to the time of Origen, who laboured to restore its text. This version being in Greek, and much used in the time of Christ and his apostles, it has been generally supposed that their quotations from the Old Testament were made from it. It is evident that several quotations in the New Testament vary from the text of the Old, as we have it in the Hebrew, and in our common versions. Some of these variations in the English version have arisen from the scrupulous fidelity and exactness of our translators, who have carefully avoided every thing like an attempt to force a harmony between the texts and the citations, where there was the least appearance of discrepancy. Yet it is obvious that in some instances, the variation is considerable, and use has been made of it by infidels against the correctness, and so against the inspiration of the Bible. This objection has not been removed, but rather strengthened by the common theory, that the apostles and evangelists quoted from the Septuagint, even where that version differed from the Hebrew and was inaccurate, provided only that its mistakes were not such as militated against their design in the use of the texts cited. (See Horne's Introduction, vol. i. chap. iv. sect. 1, edition of 1836.) According to this view, the penmen of the New Testament cannot easily be vindicated from the charge of having lent their sanction to a translation which is frequently inaccurate, and sometimes altogether erroneous. From an inspection of the quotations in the New Testament, it is evident that, in many instances, the writers have quoted from the Hebrew, where it varies from the Septuagint. In a very few instances they seem to have quoted from the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew. Mr. Horne mentions only six texts of this kind, though he notices many

more where he supposes the Septuagint to have been followed as a sufficiently accurate translation. Doubts have sometimes been started respecting these alleged quotations from the Septuagint, though perhaps nothing like a general examination of the subject, in order to disprove their theory has been attempted. It would seem as probable, and more creditable to the sacred text, to suppose that the Septuagint had borrowed the readings of texts quoted, or supposed to be quoted in the New Testament, as that the writers of the New Testament had taken their quotations from the Septuagint. It is true the Septuagint has the advantage of greater antiquity, but it would not be difficult for transcribers after the times of the apostles to alter its text, in order to promote a greater harmony between it and the New Testament. Many have supposed that attempts have been made to bring the New Testament into conformity with that version; but it seems much more reasonable to suppose that these attempts would be made upon a version, than upon the originals of the scripture. The correction of a version is what the most religious may allow without any scruple, but the alteration of the originals of the Holy Scriptures is what even corrupt men could not attempt without daring presumption.

It is at once admitted that there is a remarkable agreement between the Greek of the Old Testament and the citations of the New. A great similarity might be found in translations of the same original by different persons; but in this case the similarity is, in several cases, beyond what is accidental. Either the penmen of the New Testament quoted from the Septuagint, or the New Testament has been altered to agree with that version, or that version has been altered to agree with the New Testament, or something of all these things has happened. It may be fully admitted, that where a text was accurately translated, and known to the people in a translation with which they were familiar, the evangelists and apostles might make use of it, not needlessly changing words for others which would only express the same thing. But the main question is, where there is a difference between the quotations of the New Testament and the Hebrew, and an agreement with the Septuagint, whence has the difference on the one hand, and the agreement on the other originated? Had the evangelists and apostles been ignorant of Hebrew, or had they made no use of it in their quotations, it would seem very reasonable to say that they had quoted from a version, though this would not have been very creditable to them as mere authors, and much less as men moved, in what they wrote, by the Holy Spirit. But when they did make use of the Hebrew, and were inspired men, there seems no just reason to conclude that they cited passages from a version when it translated the original badly, and much less that they cited from that version as Scripture, what is no where to be found in the Scripture.

To arrive at the truth on this question, it is to be observed, that differences from any writing are both more natural, and more allowable in citations, than in a translation. When persons cite a passage from an author, they only cite so much as answers their particular design, and may, accordingly, omit some things, and introduce others from the context; they may make changes of numbers and persons, they may use the noun for the pronoun, and in other ways accommodate the passage to their design, and the strain of their own dis-

course. The modern way of making quotations confines us to the very words of the author; but before the introduction of the marks of quotation, writers were not so confined; they appear to have regarded it as enough to give the sense of the author with fidelity. A passage taken out of its connexion, and introduced into the discourse of another writer, will often appear very awkwardly, and sometimes be unintelligible, without alterations. The penmen of the New Testament appear to have made such alterations freely, for the purpose of framing what they cite into their own discourse, and exhibiting the sense of the passage in such a way as to answer their particular design. Thus, Gen. xv. 6, we have these words, "He believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." The connexion clearly shows that Abraham is the person intended, and when Paul cites these words, Rom. iv. 3, he very properly introduces the noun instead of the pronoun, "Abraham," says he, "believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." The Septuagint, without any necessity, or authority from the Hebrew, reads the passage in the same way with the apostle. There is no reason to suspect that the passage in the epistle to the Romans has been altered, for the apostle must have originally used the name of Abraham to make himself intelligible, but the close and unnecessary agreement of the Septuagint, in this and other passages of more importance, may excite a reasonable suspicion that it has been amended to agree with the evangelists and apostles.

The writers of the New Testament frequently combine the different texts which they quote, they enlarge them by introducing something from the context, they abridge them by omitting what has no bearing upon their design, they explain by changing that which is figurative or difficult into words better understood, they give an inference from a text as what the text teaches, they give us the sense of the original instead of scrupulously confining themselves to the words. These liberties were very proper in them; but if we find what professes to be a translation adopting the same changes without any authority from the original, it seems fair to conclude that these changes were transferred from the New Testament into that version. That this is precisely the case with the Septuagint, we think may be proved by numerous examples. The following are given as specimens in the order in which they occur.

Matt. xv. 9, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." These words our Saviour cites from Isaiah xxix. 13: "Their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men." The words "in vain" do not occur in the prophet, but appear to express the sense of the context. Because the people were guilty of the offences charged, it is threatened in the next verse that "the wisdom of their wise men should perish, and the understanding of their prudent men should be hid." They drew near to God with corrupt hearts and in corrupt ordinances, and therefore their instructors should lack wisdom, and the worshippers would receive no profit. Our Saviour appears to have incorporated these threatenings in his citation under the abridged form of declaring the worship *in vain*. The Septuagint, however, though a professed translation, uses the very same words with our Saviour, while there is nothing in the Hebrew text, or any various reading of it, corresponding to this translation. Grotius will have it that the present

Hebrew text is corrupted, and he proposes a reading agreeing with our Saviour's citation; others will have it that the Greek text of the New Testament has been corrupted and made to agree with the Septuagint. It seems as if these critics were ready to suppose any thing rather than that which is the most probable of all, that the Septuagint has been altered so as to agree with the words of our Saviour.

Luke iv. 18, 19, we have a passage from Isa. lx. 1. The last words of the verse in the prophet are as follow: "the opening of the prison to them that are bound." The whole passage is a figurative description of our Lord's works. He did not go about literally opening prisons and liberating captives, but he delivered those who were under spiritual bondage. "The opening of the prison to them that are bound" represents to us the deliverance of those who were under the bonds of sin and Satan. In the evangelist this single figure of the prophet is rendered or explained by two, representing the bonds of ignorance and affliction, "the recovering of sight to the blind, and setting at liberty them that are bruised." Of these two figures, illustrating the one used by the prophet, the Septuagint retains the former, and, that nothing cited in the New Testament might not be found in that version, some transcriber has introduced the latter figure, "setting at liberty them that are bruised," into the description of the acceptable fast, Isa. lviii. 6. In the former case the Hebrew is badly rendered by confining the bondage mentioned in the text to blindness; in the latter case, there is no rendering of the text at all, for the words are manifestly interpolated for the purpose of agreement with the New Testament.

Acts ii. 25—28, Peter, in his discourse, cites some verses of the sixteenth Psalm, and interprets the word glory, which otherwise might not have been well understood. "Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue (Hebrew, glory) was glad." The Septuagint has adopted this interpretation.

Acts vii. 14, Stephen says, "Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." This computation has a reference to those who went down to Egypt. In Gen. xlv. 26, 27, we are told that "all the souls which came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six, and the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt were two souls, all the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were threescore and ten." Moses reckons the proper children of Jacob exclusive of their wives as 66; including Jacob himself, Joseph and his two sons 70. Stephen reckons all the kindred of Jacob, and so includes the wives. The two sons of Pharez mentioned in the list of names were born in Egypt, but are reckoned as having gone down in the loins of their father. Take these from the 66, we have 64, and add to these 64 the 11 wives of Jacob's sons, we have the 75, or all the kindred mentioned by Stephen as having gone down to Egypt. But some one having observed Stephen's enumeration and supposing a discrepancy between him and Moses, has attempted to make the Septuagint agree with Stephen, and by so doing has brought out a contradiction of the Hebrew, of Stephen, and of the Septuagint itself. In this place the Septuagint is made to read thus: "All the souls which went with Jacob into Egypt, that came forth from his loins, without

the wives of the sons of Jacob, all the souls were sixty-six. But the sons of Joseph, who were born to him in the land of Egypt, were nine souls; all the souls of the house of Jacob which went with Jacob into Egypt were seventy and five souls." Gen. xlv. 26, 27, *Juxta LXX.* To make out the nine of Joseph's family, five sons born to Manasseh and Ephraim are introduced into the twentieth verse without any warrant from the Hebrew. Now, as the Septuagint excepts the wives, agreeably to the Hebrew, and Stephen expressly takes in all the kindred, this attempt at agreement brings about a flat contradiction. Moreover, as often happens in the case of frauds, something is left which betrays the imposition. In Deut. x. 22, the account of the number going down to Egypt is incidentally mentioned, and here the Septuagint reads the same as the Hebrew: "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with seventy souls." It may be safely left to every unbiassed person to judge whether, in this case, Stephen drew his account from the Septuagint, or some transcriber of the New Testament altered its text, that it might harmonize with that version; or whether some transcribers of the Septuagint altered this version, and that not with much skill, that it might agree with Stephen.

Rom. iii. 13—17, we have some quotations from the Psalms and Isaiah intermingled. A part of these verses is interpolated in the printed editions of the Septuagint, between the third and fourth verses of the thirteenth Psalm, where there is nothing in the text to warrant their insertion. This interpolation is said to be found in the margin of the Vatican Manuscript, but is not in the Alexandrine Codex. It is found in the Latin Vulgate, and is thought to have been translated into that version from some copy of the Septuagint containing the interpolation. Here then we have evidence virtually admitted that attempts have been made to alter the text of the Septuagint by the text of the New Testament.

Rom. xi. 26, we have an inference, explanation, or perhaps more properly a citation, so made as to embrace the argument founded upon it, instead of a literal translation. The passage to which the apostle refers is Isa. lix. 20, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord." The object of the apostle in referring to these words is to prove that Israel shall be again brought into the church. He finds in these words a promise that God would come to such as turned from ungodliness in Jacob; he infers that there would be such in Jacob to whom the promise would be made good, and that the Lord would fit them for the promised communion by turning them from their sins: and in the abrupt and comprehensive manner for which his style is so remarkable he throws into one his authority and his argument, citing the words thus: "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." The Septuagint has received the passage word for word into its text. Some have observed that it is difficult to see how the seventy read the Hebrew. It is very probable that the Hebrew was not read at all for the introduction of words into a version to which its text might lead a commentator, but not a translator.

Rom. xii. 20, in a quotation from the Proverbs, the apostle accommodates the language to the argumentative strain of his discourse, introducing the text with *therefore*, and inserting in it, for *in so*

doing." *Therefore* if thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink, for *in so doing*, &c., there is nothing in the Hebrew agreeing to the words, *in so doing*. It is easy to see why the apostle has introduced them, but why should the identical words have been employed by the Septuagint, or how came they into it, except from the text of the New Testament?

Gal. iii. 13, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The original text, xxi. 23, says nothing of a *tree*. This circumstance is borrowed from the preceding verse. "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a *tree*." The words cited by the apostle follow in the next verse, "He that is hanged is accursed of God." The Septuagint penmen, without any occasion for the repetition of the word *tree*, introduces it after the manner of the apostle, and so has the suspension on a tree three times repeated in the two verses.

Heb. i. 6, "And let all the angels of God worship him." This is an expression of the sense, not the exact words of Ps. xcvii. 7: "Worship him, all ye gods." The Septuagint has the exact words of the apostle, Deut. xxxii. 43: "Rejoice, O heavens, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him." Is it not very probable, if not certain, that some transcriber of the Septuagint, observing the quotation of the apostle in the epistle to the Hebrews, and not remembering any passage of the Old Testament exactly agreeing to it, considered this a suitable place to introduce it, so as to force a harmony without any warrant from the Hebrew text.

Heb. ii. 13, two passages are cited, one from Ps. xviii. 1, "I will put my trust in him." The other is from Isa. viii. 18: "Behold I, and the children which God hath given me." These are distinguished as separate quotations, by the introduction of the words, "and again," between them. The Septuagint, however, contrary to this distinction, introduces them both into Isa. viii. 17, 18, by changing "I will look for him," into, "I will put my trust in him."

Heb. x. 5—7, we have a remarkable instance of conformity in the Septuagint, where no proper citation was intended. In Ps. xl. 6, Christ is introduced as saying, "mine ears hast thou opened." The apostle, apparently as if citing, but in reality deriving an inference from these words, says, "a body hast thou prepared me." Dr. Owen, in his exposition of this epistle, shows that these words of the apostle, to which there is nothing which corresponds in the Hebrew, have been mistaken by some transcriber of the Septuagint for a translation, and transferred to its text. This instance alone is sufficient to show that there has been an attempt to harmonize this version with the New Testament by alterations of the version.

Heb. x. 37, the apostle accommodates the words of Habakkuk, ii. 3, 4, respecting the coming of the vision, and its not tarrying to the coming of Christ, substituting *he*, that is, Christ for *it*, that is, the vision. He speaks with allusion to the words, but does not formally cite them: yet this mere accommodation of the words of the prophet is introduced into the Septuagint without any material alteration; and by this means nearly half of the verse is left untranslated, and the remainder is quite perverted.

Heb. xiii. 15, the apostle gives an exhortation with allusion to the sacrifices offered under the law: "By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our

lips." He professes not to cite any place, but uses and explains ceremonial language. Some one, however, probably supposing that he was citing the words of Hosea, xiv. 2: "So shall we render the calves of our lips," has harmonized the Septuagint with the apostle in this place also, making it read, "And we will render to thee the fruit of our lips."

In 1 Pet. i. 24, 25—Rev. ii. 17, and other places, which we omit to notice, alterations of a similar character appear to have been made, in order that the citations might agree with the places cited.

If, on the one hand, the present Hebrew text be accurate, and the apostles followed the incorrect translations and interpolations of the Septuagint, how can they be vindicated from the charge of ignorance or unfaithfulness? If, on the other hand, the Septuagint be correct in the places cited, and the Hebrew corrupt, so that, as some contend, it should be amended by the Septuagint, then we are driven into a woful uncertainty respecting the text of the Bible. If, in a few quotations from the Old Testament, it be found that such a large proportion of the texts cited are corrupted, we may infer that these are but a sample of the corruption which pervade other parts, not cited; so that between the loose translations of the Septuagint and these manifold corruptions of the Hebrew, we would have very little ground for confidence that we had in our hands the very word of God. In either case, the conclusion from the common theory about these quotations from the Septuagint is inimical to a settled faith in the Scriptures. These conclusions, however, may be avoided in a way which seems to me rational and probable. The penmen of the New Testament used great liberty in omitting, adding, abridging, explaining, and otherwise altering the passages which they quoted. In this liberty they may be defended, as they gave the sense faithfully, and were not writing as translators, but as inspired commentators on the word of God. These changes, however, have been introduced into the Septuagint in a way which could never be accounted for or defended in the original translators. They were, in all probability, introduced by transcribers in the early ages of Christianity, when hardly any, if indeed any except Origen and Jerome, were acquainted with the Hebrew. These transcribers might even honestly suppose that the Hebrew, of which they were ignorant, must agree with what they regarded as quotations from it, by the evangelists and apostles, and so they might look upon their altering the text of the Septuagint by these quotations as rendering it a better translation of the original. The same ignorance of the Hebrew, which might so readily give rise to these supposed emendations of the text, might also shelter this work from detection until it was too late to be remedied.

PHILOLOGUS.

ART. II.—*Farther Remarks on the Treatment of our Coloured Population.*

MR. EDITOR,—In the remarks which I have heretofore made, I think the following propositions have been irrefragably established:

1st. That the system of slavery, as practised in our country, is calculated to keep the people of colour in a state of hopeless degradation.

2d. That this system has been built up and sustained by the action of the whole community. And,

3d. That all expectation of separating the blacks from the whites is visionary and chimerical.

May we not, then, safely defy the ingenuity of man to point out any but three courses, one of which, events must necessarily take in reference to this momentous subject. The Africans must be granted that freedom which will elevate them to substantial citizenship, with all its attendant blessings, or they must remain as they are, the curse of our country's fame and the bane of its prosperity, physically, intellectually, and morally, or their blood must sink into the earth, crying for vengeance on those who *have been their keepers*, and their bones whiten those fields on which they have toiled, and suffered, and bled. Is the God of heaven, then, not saying to us, this day, "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him."

The inquiry presses itself irresistibly upon us, What shall be done? It is vain to try to blink the question. As sure as the wheels of Providence roll on the events of futurity, so sure will we have to grapple with this monster, in all its deformity. It bespeaks neither wisdom nor courage to retreat from an enemy, while an unalterable destiny has decreed we shall meet. If those be censurable who are urging us on to the conflict, with that intemperate zeal which is not according to knowledge, and which characterizes the fanatic rather than the Christian, neither can we acquit others of blame, who fold up their hands, and cry, peace, peace, while a voice is heard from above, saying, "*There is no peace.*" It is matter of astonishment how professing Christians can rest satisfied under existing circumstances. There are few, if any, denominations amongst us who do not acknowledge some of these prostrated beings as our brethren, in the strictest sense of the word. Let such prayerfully ponder the injunctions of divine truth. One citation may suffice, out of the innumerable array which might be advanced. "But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." Who possesses more of this world's good than the free people of this country? Our lines have indeed fallen in pleasant places, and the Lord has bestowed upon us a large and a fruitful heritage. We not only possess the glory of all lands, but in civil, political, and religious freedom we are blest far beyond other nations. The God of providence may justly challenge us, and say, "What could I have done for you more than I have done?" On the other hand, look at our brethren of colour, and point to those who are more needy than they. Can the Christian reconcile it to his conscience to take sweet counsel, to go up to God's house, to partake of feasts of love with those who are liable, at any moment, to be sold to the heathen, to be maltreated in their persons, to be tarnished in their reputation without redress, and still shut up his bowels of compassion from them?

But what ought to be done? The solution of this question is easy, and the answer short. Unfetter the bondman, and restore him to freedom.

Is the task an arduous one? It may be so; but consider the right-

teousness of the cause, and the glory that must crown a successful effort. What a triumph would it be to our common Christianity? It may be asserted that, since the day that the powers of darkness were overwhelmed by the heralds of the cross, sustained by visible tokens of divine power, such a victory has hardly been obtained. What would be its political bearings? It would more than double the productive energies of three millions of our people. In the same ratio it would increase the consumption of this same class. Instead of having enemies in our midst, whom we dread, we would have a phalanx of devoted freemen on our southern border that would bid defiance to every invading foe. Agriculture, commerce, manufactures, literature, arts, science, in a word, every pursuit, useful or ornamental, would feel its vivifying influence, and our country would receive an impulse such as it has never felt, which would urge her onward with an accelerated force and majesty that would leave the nations of the world far behind. It is not my purpose, however, to present views of political economy, and more on that head need not be added here.

As a triumph of the pure principles of Christianity, who would dare to cast the vast amount? Many are sanguine that the day is not distant when the Sun of Righteousness will arise, with healing in his wings, enlightening with his rays the dark places of the earth, and bring in the fulness of the gentile nations. Efforts are making for scattering the seed of the gospel truth far and wide, that the places of horrid cruelty may be converted into abodes of peace and love. It would be unkind, perhaps unjust, to censure such efforts, but so far as our countrymen are engaged in them, it might be well to ponder whether these efforts are directed in the best possible manner. As they stand connected with the subject on hand, I would beg leave to suggest a few ideas for consideration, not, certainly, with the intention of discouraging missionary enterprise among the heathen, but to enforce the necessity of purifying our own Zion.

When we bear the gospel message to heathen lands, what is the language we hold to those who are sitting in darkness? We tell them we present to them, from the King of kings, the great charter of their religious, civil and political rights. We give an assurance, so far as language can do it, that we furnish them with a code of laws, precepts, and directions, which, if they will accept and obey, will banish tyranny, injustice, and oppression of every name. Not only will it do this, but we tell them it will purify, elevate, and fraternize the whole community, so that, as brethren, they will dwell together in amity and in concord. Blind as the blindest of mankind are, they are not destitute of natural reason, and "by their fruits shall ye know them" is perfectly on a level with their comprehension. What will naturally be their conclusions when they learn from the mouth of this messenger from the purest and most Christian nation on earth, that the principles which he holds forth, though they have been professed from the infancy of our existence as a people, so far from purifying and fraternizing us, have left mingled with us a host of human beings which must appear to these worshippers of stocks and stones as sunk far beneath themselves in the scale of existence? If we tell the tyrants of other lands that, through the sacred influence of our holy religion, justice and judgment are the pillars on which our institutions rest, and that to the

lowest and meanest amongst us justice holds her scales with as steady a hand as for the highest and most honourable, can they but sneer when they learn that one-fifth of our nation are scarcely known as human beings at all, but are, in all respects, regarded as little better than irrational animals?

Look, then, at the glory of the conquest. It would not be a triumph like that won by a foreign kingdom, where the many compelled the few to accept the terms that were offered, without consulting their will, and where political and national aggrandizement might have had much influence with the controlling power, and where such action could not affect either national institutions or established customs. Neither would it be a case in any respect like that which has occurred in several of our sister commonwealths at home. In them it was, perhaps, for the most part, an unwilling sacrifice by the master; and, at all events, the number of those who were restored to freedom could scarcely be felt either in the body politic or the body social. Widely different, indeed, would be the merits of our southern friends, should they manifest the magnanimity, the true Christian heroism, of granting liberty to their slaves. It would stand out, in bold relief, as an act of moral sublimity unequalled in grandeur, challenging the admiration of an astonished world. Should the whole United States unite in disenthraling the coloured people, and placing them on the footing of freemen *in deed* and in *truth*, it would be presenting the church in our country as a city set on a hill, the hallowed influences and sacred light of which would be seen and felt in the remotest corners of our globe. On the contrary, while they remain amongst us an outcast race, it will be vain to expect a blessing from on high. It will prove a wedge of gold, a Babylonish garment in the camp of our Israel, which will, it is much to be feared, discomfit our best appointed attacks upon the kingdom of darkness in foreign and heathen countries.

What is the primary obstacle which lies in the way of freeing the people of colour, and from which all others emanate? It is neither more nor less than the absence of a proper Christian spirit. Were men generally disposed to come fully up to the requirements of the divine law, without stipulated or mental reservations, every difficulty would in a moment vanish. Viewing the subject of slavery in our country through the medium of the perfect law of God, we are constrained to come to the conclusion that the master does himself more injury than he does the slave. It is an obvious principle, as I have, perhaps, more than once stated, which pervades the sacred volume, that it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong. Much, then, as the whites wrong the blacks, it would seem that they wrong themselves still more. It is only by viewing things through a *distorted* medium that we come to the conclusion that our enjoyments can be enhanced, or our true interests promoted, by infringing upon the rights or marring the enjoyments of others. Is any one so skeptical as not to believe that if every son and daughter of Adam were put in possession of all the happiness of which they are susceptible, that his own true pleasures would be greatly increased? Unless this Christian feeling can be much improved and extended, it is folly to hope that the benefits of freedom can be conferred on the oppressed. Indeed, if any one possessed a despotic power which would enable him to break the fetters which bind

them, and yet could make no impression on the hearts of their oppressors, the exertion of such power would be, at best, an act of doubtful propriety, as it could not fail to lead to scenes of horrid anarchy and bloodshed. Efforts, then, must be made to cultivate and diffuse this Christian spirit, or it is obvious that nothing beneficial can be effected. I shall, therefore, briefly notice some of the obstacles over which people usually stumble, and conclude by assaying to point out some of the positive duties which we owe those whom we have so grievously wronged.

It is urged upon us, that if we free the slaves, and suffer them to remain in our country, they will prove little better than lawless banditti, preying upon our property, thirsting to avenge themselves for injuries which they have received at our hands, filling the land with crime, and endangering the stability of our social and political institutions. We are referred to the statistics of our jails and penitentiaries as proof positive that they will prove a curse to the country. That these fears are unfounded in some respects is, doubtless, true; nor is it less true that in others they would, in all probability, be, to a certain extent, realized. What has been our conduct toward them but a long continued course of injustice and cruelty? and can we expect to escape, entirely, the scourge of Heaven? National sins can meet no retribution, as such, beyond the grave; and just as sure as we have, as a people, wronged the African race, just as certainly must we bear the national punishment, or God is no longer King of nations, nor are justice and judgment the pillars of his throne. A sacrifice must be made, or we insult the majesty of Heaven if we look for a blessing upon our country, even in efforts to reinstate the bondman in the enjoyment of freedom. For centuries we have been treating them as beasts of burden, denying them that culture which strengthens and enlarges the understanding, and purifies the faculties of the soul. In this wretched condition, can we expect them to entertain a scrupulous regard for truth, for justice, for integrity, or whatever else enters into the composition of the character that is suited to discharge the duties which the laws of the country require. If this be the case with respect to the severer virtues, what can we look for in reference to taste and sentiment? Whose fault is it that they are thus debased, and to a great extent unfitted to discharge relative and social duties with that delicacy and refinement which we expect from good citizens? It is ours, and not theirs; and the forfeit we must pay, either willingly or unwillingly. We must either prepare to offer the sacrifice, that Heaven may be appeased, or we may prepare for that awful reckoning which, perhaps at no distant day, we will be called upon to make, when repentance will prove unavailing.

Repentance is sometimes said to be an up-hill business. It is so, however, only in consequence of the unsanctified nature of our souls. Why is it that we shrink at the idea of cutting off right hands, and casting from us right eyes? It is simply because of the imperfect work of grace in our hearts. If we entertain toward a portion of our brethren antipathies and prejudices, which operate as a barrier to Christian fellowship and sympathy, we may rest assured, that if there be grace in our hearts, it is imperfect as to degree, and weak in its operation. It is mournful to witness so many evidences existing, even among those from whom we might expect better things,

that they not only do not mourn over the prevalence of such unhallowed prepossessions, but that they would consider themselves as grossly insulted, if any one were even to suppose that the case was otherwise with them. On what other principle can we account for that predominant delusion which so extensively prevails, that the descendants of Japhet and the children of Ham can never become homogeneous, can never live amicably together, can never reciprocate the sympathies of the soul, or commune with each other in fellowship with their risen Lord and Saviour? That there is something of this in most of our hearts, few will deny; but it ought to be matter of mourning and sorrow; and it is a fearful omen that we love to have it so, when we would subject others to the infliction of wrong, that we may escape the humbling process of having our corruptions mortified. Whatever we do, let us not fly in the face of the Almighty for his providential dealings with us. Whatever we do, let us not Cain-like fly from the presence of our Maker, because our brother is more righteous than we. Let us rather feel the rod, and him who hath appointed it, and receive with becoming submission and humility the chastisements which our Heavenly Father may be pleased to measure out to us.

But, say some, the people of colour must not be set free in our midst, or all the horrors of amalgamation will be entailed upon us; and what is not a little strange, many who earnestly insist that slavery is in its very nature immoral, join with them in their denunciations. I feel assured I shall stand acquitted before my readers of wantonly charging others with entertaining contradictory or inconsistent sentiments; but really it appears difficult, if not impossible, (if slavery be in its very constitution sinful,) to reconcile the idea of retaining the blacks in bondage, through a long series of years, with the rectitude of the moral law. Is it possible that the dispensations of Providence have been such towards us as to involve the necessity of transgressing the laws of the Divine Being? AMALGAMATION appears to have become a perfect shibboleth for the rallying of parties, without reference to common sense or revealed truth, and while my pen unconsciously traces these lines, I feel it chilled with a presentiment that the hearts, if not the eyes, of those for whom they are intended will be closed against them. But since I have undertaken to vindicate the rights of outraged humanity, wo is me if I halt between two opinions—since I have undertaken to plead in behalf of my oppressed, my bleeding countrymen, parched by my tongue, and palsied by my hand, if I handle the word of God deceitfully, or pandering to corrupt ambitious lusts, which war against the Spirit. Let it be borne in mind, however, that I have heretofore, and do still disavow all thoughts of advocating the union of whites and blacks in the bonds of matrimony; but I assume not this position because I regard such union contrary to the laws of nature or revelation. Nature and revelation coincide in representing the whole human race as one great family, united by common ties, and as having a common destiny. If this be the case, why, it may be asked, do we hesitate about approving marriages entered into by parties the most remote and dissimilar? Now, to be candid, no better reason can be given than that we are *weak*. It was certainly lawful for the apostle Paul to eat meat, yet he solemnly declares he would eat no meat while the world stood, if it would offend a weak brother. If Christians had the strength which would enable them to say with

truth, in reference to their affections, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, barbarian or Scythian," we should hear nothing of the horrors of amalgamation from their lips.

There is no truth more reasonable or more susceptible of proof, than that error in principle leads to error in practice. So it is here. It will not be in the power of man to prevent finally the amalgamation of all the different tribes of the human family, both in our own and in foreign lands; but without controversy, nothing will more certainly put a stop to that shameful amalgamation which is now in process, than the elevation of our coloured people. It is true indeed, that if they were thus elevated, intermarriages would be more frequent than they now are; but who would not prefer such commerce carried on according to the directions of that law which is holy, just, and good, to the carrying it on in a way to prostrate every virtuous sentiment and feeling of the human heart? And here it may not be amiss to notice how prone public sentiment, even in the religious part of the community, is to run into error on such subjects. If a man in the purity of his soul loves and weds what doubtless appears to him a most interesting lady of colour, and by her raises a family, bestowing upon them all the care of a pious parent, he is railed at, and treated with all the scorn and contempt which usually fall to the lot of the most abandoned, and this too by persons who assume to themselves credit for superior attainments and sanctity. On the other hand, if a gentleman covers his plantations with his illegitimate offspring, dooming them to ignorance, toil, and all the horrors of a wretched bondage, he may still be regarded as a patron saint, at least in politics and polite society!

Man was created a commercial being. The various climes, the various productions of our globe, the facilities which nature has furnished for making exchanges, and man's numerous wants, all unite in declaring that a free commercial intercourse in the exchange of the productions of our world was intended by our Creator. That he is intended for a commercial being, in reference to the productions of the understanding, is equally clear. As an individual, isolated being, he is perhaps the most helpless of any of God's creatures; but by mutual aid and assistance, he becomes lord of the world below. Is he not destined, is it not the intention of his Maker that he should be commercial in his affections also? In fact, how can he carry on, to the utmost advantage, an exchange of the productions of nature, or the advances of mind, how can he render that mutual aid and assistance, which his helpless dependent situation emphatically requires, unless he be united in the bonds of affection?

The family of mankind is characterized by an endless variety of distinctive marks, both in its mental and physical structure. To pronounce this a defect in its constitution, would be to arraign the wisdom and providence of God; and to fail to appreciate the beauty of such variety, and profit by the advantages held forth, argues neither the acuteness of the commercial man, nor the piety of the Christian. Is there any greater crime, or even impropriety in uniting the black colour with the white, than the Grecian head with the Calmuck? Is all the beauty and energy of the human constitution, both mental and physical, necessarily developed by any particular structure of the body or colour of the skin with which we are acquainted? If it be desirable for the promotion of symmetry and

vigour of body, for the promotion of mental energy, for the promotion of extended fraternal feeling to prohibit the union of persons within certain degrees of consanguinity, is it not absurd to say there is any thing wrong in itself, in uniting the most distant and dissimilar branches of the descendants of one common ancestor?

What a pity it is that Christians do not more fully realize their destiny! Is it one family, one tribe, one nation, which absorbs all the sympathies of their souls? Will even one world fill the anxious cravings of the understanding, or satisfy the outgoings of the heart? A full fruition of the things that may be known and enjoyed, in the present life, and connected with our world, is indeed much; but we do ourselves great injustice, if we circumscribe the efforts of the understanding, or the range of the affections within limits so straitened and obscure. Why not, by way of foretaste, make ourselves familiar with every mode of existence, with every grade of intelligence which doubtless diversify and render glorious that frame of extended nature, whose outskirts we are here permitted to survey? Is it possible that there is one being so lost, so dead to the overflowings of a benevolent soul, that he will withhold the hand or the heart from those whom he regards as destined to hold communion with him in rapturous enjoyments, to be realized far beyond yon distant orb, whose dim and straggling rays but feebly tell us that it has a being? Let us not deceive ourselves. Nothing is more certain, than that our future condition will be exactly suited to the inclinations and desires, to the frames of our hearts while here on earth. How dangerous then to indulge in a rancorous frame of spirit! If we cannot take delight and complacency in God's children here, whether white or black, what can, what must we expect, but to be excluded from their society in the realms of bliss?

I am aware that physiological objections will be urged in opposition to the suggestions here set forth; but the man of piety and the enlightened philanthropist will be slow to believe that the facts, on which such objections are supposed to be founded, are the result of sober inquiry and impartial observation. But admit the fact, that in some cases the descending race follow in the course of the inferior parent, without receiving any advantage from the more elevated one, it can only be regarded as an exception to the general rule, and militates not against the views here maintained. But I must bring this somewhat lengthy communication to a close; for although it might not be altogether irrelevant to pursue this inquiry farther, yet it would lead me beyond the limits which I have prescribed to myself. Be the facts what they may, it will at once strike the reader that it is a point which can, with no propriety, be made a subject of church regulation or civil enactment, but ought to be left to that prudence and discretion, which individuals will ever exercise better than public authorities can possibly administer.

A. R.

ART. III.—*Symbolical Language of Scripture.* No. II.

It was proposed first to consider those symbols that are borrowed from remarkable objects in nature. *Heaven*, or the *heavens*, is very often used in a figurative sense, sometimes alone, and sometimes with *the earth* joined to it, and in either case, it is of very extensive meaning.

1. The first idea naturally suggested by *heaven* is, that it is *high* above the reach of changes and evils in this world, that it is therefore *permanent*, the place of *peace and happiness*. Accordingly, this is often its symbolical meaning, as, Deut. xi. 21: "That your days may be—as *the days of heaven* upon earth." That is, that ye may enjoy *long life and happiness* in the secure possession of the land. Ps. xi. 4: "The Lord's throne is in *heaven*." His power and government are *unchangeably* righteous. Ps. ciii. 19, is nearly in the same words, and of the same meaning. Ps. xxxvi. 5: "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the *heavens*." Very great and *unchangeably* sure. Ps. lxxxix. 29:—his throne as *the days of heaven*; verse 2: "Thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in *the very heavens*." These expressions will be easily understood by the preceding examples; but the last mentioned may also be taken as strictly literal. The faithfulness of God will be perfectly and eternally established, or manifested by his bringing every true believer, in due time, to heavenly blessedness.

2. Heaven is used to signify, *high*, in respect to honour and power; because properly, all honour and power come from the God of heaven as their fountain. Accordingly, the term is often used to denote the high stations among men. Isa. xiv. 12: "How art thou fallen *from heaven*, O Lucifer." That is, the king and kingdom of Babylon, which had held such *eminent dignity* among the nations, as might be compared to the morning star among the rest of the stars, was stripped of their glory and entirely reduced. Eph. ii. 6: "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together *in heavenly places*, in Christ Jesus." That is, he hath exalted us from the lowest grade of misery, to a rank of *spiritual honour and enjoyment* among his children. I am aware that various views are given of the expression here; but believe this, and the rule above given, the only key that will fit it, in all places where it occurs. Rev. xii. 7: "There was war *in heaven*." A great conflict between the religion of Jesus and heathen idolatry, even among *the great and powerful of the world*." Verse 8: "And the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was their place found any more *in heaven*." That is, Christianity, as to its outward form and profession, triumphed over all opposition, and idolatry fell into disrepute, and was professedly renounced *by those in power*. Verse 5: "Her child was caught up *to God and to his throne*." This expression has much the same meaning as *heaven*, namely: he was set *in safety and honour*. Ch. xi. 12: "God's two witnesses ascended *up to heaven* in a cloud," &c., is the very same.

When *the earth* is joined with *heaven*, by way of opposition, it has, of course, an opposite signification. Lam. ii. 1: "The Lord hath cast down, *from heaven* unto *the earth*, the beauty of Israel." That is, the *dignity, power, and prosperity* of Israel was, by the Chaldean ravages, converted into a scene of *desolation and misery*. Rev. xii. 9: "And the great dragon was cast out—he was cast out *into the earth*," &c. That is, the practice of idolatry, being now disgraceful or unfashionable, was left to the *lowest grades of society*, and the *obscure parts of the world*.

3. Heaven signifies that which is holy and spiritual, and is, therefore, used as a symbol of *the church*, because such is properly her character, a *holy, spiritual kingdom*, which is concerned about heavenly

things. Rev. xiv. 6: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach," &c. This denotes a great increase of preachers and of zeal in the preaching of the gospel, with a corresponding power in the church and the world. Ch. viii. 1:—"There was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour." That is, the church had a short period of quiet.

When the earth is joined to heaven, in this sense of it, by way of distinction, and not of opposition, it signifies the civil state, because to it belong earthly things, as heavenly things belong to the church. Isa. li. 16:—"That I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundation of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people." This is an allusion to God's organizing Israel into a church, and giving them a civil constitution as a nation, on their coming out of Egypt. Isa. lxxv. 17, also Rev. xxi. 1:—"A new heaven and a new earth," signifies such a renovation of the church, and also of civil governments, both being carried to such admirable perfection as might be thought an entire new creation.

From these notices of the simple figure, its combinations, which are only additions of certain circumstances, may be readily explained.

1. The *host of heaven*—Literally means the heavenly bodies, which very fully represent ordinances, and the various ranks of rulers. Accordingly, this is the symbolical meaning.

When the subject in hand is the church, then, of course, the *host of heaven* signifies ecclesiastical rules and ordinances; and when the subject is any nation as such, the host must mean ordinances and officers of a civil kind. Dan. viii. 10: "And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven, and it cast down some of the host, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." That is, the power there spoken of would increase, and arrogate authority over all ordinances and rulers in church and state. Rev. xix. 14: "And the armies, (or hosts,) which were in heaven, followed him upon white horses." That is, the ministers of Christ, having his gracious presence with them, go forth to preach the gospel in its purity, with great zeal and success. Isa. xxxiv. 4: "All the host of heaven shall be dissolved," &c. This is part of the judgment threatened on Idumea, of course the host of heaven signifies all their rulers and civil institutions, which should be utterly destroyed and brought to nothing.

2. The *kingdom of heaven*, or the *kingdom of God*.—This is a symbol of very frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and with a considerable variety of meaning. It seems to be derived from the expression of Daniel ii. 44: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," &c.; therefore when respect is had to the time of accomplishing that prophecy, the *kingdom of heaven* signifies the period of the gospel dispensation, as in Mat. iii. 2: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The time is come for the erection of the new dispensation.

When respect is had to its outward form, it signifies the visible church, as Mat. v. 19: "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Again, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind." And many other places, where it has the same meaning.

When respect is had to its spiritual character, it signifies the true church, including all real believers, as Mat. viii. 11:—"Many shall

come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." That is, many of all nations shall be brought, by the gospel, into fellowship with Christ, and the communion of the saints. John iii. 3:—"Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." That is, he cannot understand nor partake of the spiritual privileges of believers.

3. We read of *rending the heavens*, and *bowing the heavens*. The visible heavens are often spoken of as the veil or curtain of God's glorious habitation, which hides him from our view; therefore to rend the heavens, is to remove whatever hinders his people from beholding him spiritually. Isa. lxiv. 1: "O that thou wouldst rend the heavens," &c. That is, that thou wouldst, in a special manner, manifest thyself to us. To bow the heavens is much of the same meaning with the idea of condescension in God's manifestation of himself, and interposition for his people. Ps. xviii. 9: "He bowed down the heavens also, and came down." That is, with wonderful condescension he appeared and interposed in my behalf. The same symbol with the same meaning occurs, Ps. cxliv. 5.

4. *Opening of heaven* signifies the discovery of heavenly mysteries. Ezek. i. 1: *The heavens were opened*. No doubt such an appearance was literally presented to the prophet's vision, but the meaning was as we have given it; accordingly it follows, *I saw visions of God*. John i. 51: "Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." That is, ye shall have heavenly mysteries opened to you, and shall see in Christ, the meaning and fulfilment of the vision which Jacob had at Bethel, Gen. xxviii. 12. Again, Rev. iv. 1: "After this I looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven." The meaning is the same, accordingly it follows,—*I will show thee things which must be hereafter*.

5. *Riding on the heavens, on the clouds, &c.*, signifies glorious majesty and power. Deut. xxxiii. 26:—"Who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency upon the sky." That is, he proceeds with great majesty and power for the help of his people. Ps. lxviii. 4: *He rides upon the heavens by his name JAH*, is the same meaning. *Riding on the clouds, on a cherub, &c.*, has also the idea of great swiftness, in proceeding to execute his purpose. Ps. xviii. 10: "He rode upon a cherub, and did fly." That is, he came speedily, and with great majesty and power, to my help. Ps. civ. 3: "He maketh the clouds his chariots, who walketh upon the wings of the wind." Isa. xix. 1: "Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud," &c. Rev. xiv. 14: "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud, one sat like unto the Son of man:" all are of the same meaning.

6. *Shaking the heavens and the earth*.—We have the undoubted signification of this symbol, Heb. xii. 27. It signifies the removal of those things that are shaken. We must remember, however, that it is to be applied in a suitableness to the subject in hand, whether that be the church or the nations of the world. Isa. ii. 19: "When he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." That is, when he proceeds to execute his terrible judgments in the overthrow of the ungodly nations, ch. xiii. 13: "Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place." This chapter is a denunciation of judgment against Babylon, and this figure signifies the terrible convulsions and utter overthrow of that kingdom. Joel

iii. 16: "The Lord shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem, *and the heavens and the earth shall shake.*" Hag. ii. 6: "Yet once, it is a little while, and *I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land.*" The meaning of both places, is in the following words: "And *I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms* of the heathen. And the apostle farther teaches us in Heb. xii. 26, 27, that it signified a complete revolution in the church also, by the removal of the Old Testament worship and ceremonies, and substituting the new in their place.

7. *The earthquake* has very much the same meaning as the preceding figure. When the shaking of the earth is mentioned, simply as an effect, and not a positive work of God, it signifies the solemn fear and dread that is due to his Holy Majesty, or is merely a token of his presence. Ps. lxxviii. 8: "The earth *shook*, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God." Acts iv. 31: "And when they had prayed, the *place was shaken* where they were assembled together." &c. In both these cases, the shaking of the earth was, no doubt, a literal fact: but its symbolical meaning was, nevertheless, as above. When the shaking is represented as of a convulsive kind, or accompanied with other terrific emblems, it signifies great changes and revolutions in civil affairs. Ps. lxxv. 3: "The earth, and all the inhabitants thereof, are dissolved." That is, all the institutions for maintaining order and justice in society, are so corrupted that *they are in a manner ceased*. Rev. viii. 5: "And there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, *and an earthquake.*" Also ch. xi. 19, and xvi. 18, we have the same figure, signifying the *convulsion and overthrow of kingdoms*, by the judgments of God, war, &c.

8. *The entire removal of the heavens and the earth*, has the same general meaning, but in a higher degree. Isa. xxxiv. 4: "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree." This is the judgment denounced on Idumea, and signifies the complete destruction of that nation: their rulers, their nobles, and armies should be brought to nothing, and the very frame and being of their government should be dissolved and cease. Rev. vi. 12—14:—"And lo, there was a great earthquake, and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind, and *the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island were moved out of their places.*" That is, a revolution took place, great and wonderful, sudden and complete; heathen idolatry was defeated and overthrown, and cast down at once, never to regain the same power and respect, and all its supporters sunk into disgrace, as it is explained in the following verses of the same chapter: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains," &c.

The next remarkable objects in nature, from which symbols are borrowed, are *the sun, moon, and stars*. They are very frequent-

ly employed, though not altogether. The natural use of these bodies is, first, to *rule* over the day and over the night, then to give *light* upon the earth. Hence, also, they are the *most manifest and public* objects. The sun is, moreover, the source of *comfort and growth to the earth*. These ideas will, therefore, serve to explain all the symbols in which they are found.

1. Considered as to their situation being plainly visible to all, the sun signifies that which is most public and plain. Rev. xix. 17: "And I saw an angel *standing in the sun*, and he cried with a loud voice," &c. That is he proclaimed *in the most public manner, and in the clearest light*, the speedy and utter destruction of the combined enemies of Christ and his church.

2. Considered as *ruling*, they signify the various orders of *rulers* in the church or in civil society, as the subject may be, as, Rev. vi. 12, 13:—"The sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell," &c. Also, Dan. viii. 10; both before noticed.

3. Considered as to their light and glory, they signify the *means and ordinances for diffusing and preserving true knowledge*. Rev. xii. 1: "A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." That is, the church in the enjoyment of the *clear and spiritual ordinances* of the gospel dispensation, comparable to the sun, much above what had been under the *Old Testament*, which was only as the light of the moon. She is, also, now adorned by the ministry of those *eminent teachers*, the twelve apostles.

4. Considered as to their influence on the earth, they signify *comfort and prosperity*. Ps. lxxxiv. 11: "For the Lord God is a sun and shield." From the application of the figure here, its meaning is more large and full. He is the source of all light, life, comfort, and growth to his people. Mal. iv. 2: "To you that fear my name shall the *Sun of righteousness* arise," &c. That is, Christ who is the source of spiritual light, comfort, and righteousness to believers.

When they are distinguished, in this respect, from God and Christ, they signify spiritual ordinances as the means of comfort. Isa. lx. 19: "The sun shall be no more thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light." And the same occurs, Rev. xxi. 23. That is, the church shall then enjoy a degree of *knowledge, comfort, and communion with God*, as far superior to any thing previous, as if all her *ordinances* were superseded by the immediate and glorious presence of God and the Lamb.

5. A star, when in connexion with the sun and moon, signifies only an inferior ruler, but taken singly, an *illustrious prince*. Num. xxiv. 17: "There shall come a *star* out of Jacob." That is, a mighty and victorious king. The *day star* is but once mentioned. 2 Pet. i. 19:—"Until the day dawn, and the *day star* arise in your hearts." It is here considered, as to its light, as compared with the darkness of night, and signifies, till the *day of glory* dawn on the soul, when spiritual things will be clearly seen, and compared with which, the greatest light enjoyed here is but darkness.—*The bright and morning star* is mentioned but once, Rev. xxii. 16. And it is expressly claimed by Christ as one of his titles, "I am the bright and morning star," &c.

The combinations of this symbol are neither very many, nor very complicated. They are such as,

1. Being deprived of the sun's light, to signify a falling into adversity. Job xxx. 28: "I went mourning *without the sun.*" That is, I was deprived of comfort, and brought into great affliction. Jer. xv. 9: "Her *sun is gone down* while it is yet day." Amos viii. 9: "I will cause *the sun to go down at noon*, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." Both of these passages are of the same signification, namely: their prosperity should suddenly come to an end, and great adversity come upon them. Mic. iii. 6: "The *sun shall go down* over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them." That is, their popularity shall quickly vanish, when the calamities predicted by the true prophets shall come to pass, and these thereby proved to be liars.

2. *The increase and continuance of sunshine*, signifies *remarkable prosperity*. Isa. xxx. 26: "Moreover the light of the moon, shall be as the light of the sun, and the *light of the sun shall be seven-fold*, as the light of seven days." That is, it shall be a time of unparalleled knowledge and *spiritual prosperity*. Ch. lx. 20: "*Thy sun shall no more go down*, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself." It shall be a time of wonderful freedom from all kinds of afflictions, and of the enjoyment of every blessing, as the whole chapter particularly explains.

Isa. xxiv. 23: "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion," &c. This symbol, though apparently opposite in the terms of it is, nevertheless, to the same amount, namely: the light of the sun and moon shall be so far surpassed that they shall be ashamed. That is, the glory and happiness of that period of Christ's kingdom shall utterly eclipse all that has preceded it.

3. The excessive and hurtful heat of the sun, signifies oppression and persecution. Mat. iv. 6, comp. 17. Song i. 6: "Look not upon me because I am black, because *the sun hath looked upon me.*" That is, I have been exposed to *persecution* from the world. Isa. xlix. 10: "They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the heat nor *sun smite them.*" That is, they shall be no more *afflicted and persecuted*. Rev. vii. 16, is quoted from this, and, of course, has the same meaning. Rev. xvi. 1: "And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun, and power was given him to *scorch men with fire.*" That is, as a judgment of God, a dreadful spirit of tyranny possessed those in power, so that they oppressed and persecuted those under them intolerably.

4. *The diminishing or destruction of the sun, moon, and stars*, signifies the reduction or overturning of nations or great changes in the church: it generally accompanies the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and has already been noticed under that particular. Two remarkable passages, in which it occurs, may be examined, Joel ii. 31, and Mat. xxiv. 29.

5. The falling of one star, signifies, not simply the fall of an individual ruler, but of an entire order of rulers. Rev. viii. 10:—"And there fell *a great star from heaven*, burning as it had been a lamp." That is, that particular *order of civil rulers or form of government* was subverted. Ch. ix. 1: "And I saw *a star fall from heaven to the earth.*" That is, the whole order of the Christian ministry, *corrupted, debased*, and become earthly, &c.

ART. IV.—*How may the people know when to countenance men as sent?*

Ans. It will not be necessary, at this time, to say any thing respecting the mission of the first reformers, as whatever was done in a confused and broken time of the church, such as that in which they lived, cannot be drawn into precedent at this time. If they observed, as closely as circumstances would admit, the appointed way of entering the ministry, and if they publicly manifested, to the satisfaction of the godly and discerning, their ability and their faithfulness, their mission is not to be called in question. And, that they did so, is freely acknowledged by all, except Roman Catholics and their friends.

The preacher that has not a mission from any church, while he has it in his power to make application for it, is not to be countenanced as one sent. This will be conceded by all. If he be so uninformed as not to know that a mission from some church is necessary, he is not qualified, and so not sent. If he knows, but will not, in this very thing he shows that he is not sent; because he acts in disobedience to the authority of Christ, or in direct opposition to it. Of late years, there have been several instances of female preachers, and some indications of a disposition to favour them; but this we deem unworthy of a serious refutation.

Those who preach under a license are not to be considered as yet sent. They are only allowed to exercise their talents before the church, to give the people opportunity to judge of their qualifications; and their preaching may be considered as a continuation of their trials. And it is a highly necessary and scriptural precaution: "Lay hands suddenly on no man," 1 Tim. v. 22.

If a man has been tried as to his qualifications, has been approved and ordained in the regular way, we say that, in ordinary cases, he is to be considered as sent. But here we must explain. While every true church has authority to send men to preach the *gospel as revealed in the word*, and to teach *all things whatsoever Christ* has commanded, no church has authority to send them to teach *one single error*, or to make, or maintain, one single deviation in doctrine, worship, or order, from that which Christ has commanded. For, says the apostle, "We can do nothing *against* the truth, but *for* the truth," 2 Cor. xiii. 8. The church has no authority in or over this matter, but what she has received from Christ; and it cannot be believed, without blasphemy, that he would give it to teach or maintain such a thing. In proof of this, were it needful, we might refer to all the strict and solemn charges given from the time that Moses was sent, down to the sending of the apostles; and we should find them all to be according to the tenor of Deut. iv. 2, "Ye shall not add to the word that I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God," &c. Many true churches allow errors and innovations to be taught in them, which we may charitably suppose to be done through ignorance, made strong by prejudice. And it is abstractly true, that the authority which they have from Christ is so far perverted; and that, so far as their ministers teach these errors or innovations, their authority is null and void. But, until they discover this to be the case, it is not to be expected that either they

or the people will admit it to be so, or act according to it. Their courts will continue to send men to teach their errors, under the impression that they are truths, and their people will acknowledge them to be sent.

But I will now suppose that the people of one or more true churches do clearly see these errors and innovations of their neighbouring societies, and openly profess their convictions before the world respecting them, in what light are *they* to view the ministers that maintain them, sent or not sent?

Ans. They are not to deny that they have authority to teach *truth*—or, the *all things whatsoever Christ* has commanded; but they ought to deny that they have any to teach *error*, or to hold back any of these “all things.” And since they are the ministers of their whole system or creed, and especially of its peculiarities, it is fair to infer that their whole ministry, as separate and distinguished from the ministry of others, goes to propagate and maintain what errors or innovations may be in it, and that they are *always*, either by express purpose, or necessary consequence, doing this. Therefore, the people, as named in the supposition, ought to deny that they are sent to preach *as they do it*. This is the position which all the people of the Associate Church, if they mean to be consistent, are bound to take, in regard to the ministers of other churches. They are not sent to preach *as they do it*. This is not to deny that they preach truth, and it may be the leading truths of the gospel; but it is to affirm that they *always combine* error with it, either in express terms or by necessary consequence, which Christ never authorized. Let the reader suppose, if he is one that thinks this “a *hard saying*,” that some individual, among the many members of other churches, makes application, to some session under the Associate Synod, to be received as a member of their congregation, but *on condition* that they will allow him to hold his peculiar views; I will suppose, for the sake of argument, that he is a friend to the congregational plan of church government; ought that session to admit him? You will certainly say, if they mean to be honest to their profession, or faithful to their ordination, *they will not*. If you are attached to that cause, or a friend to the applicant, you will say they *ought not*. Were he admitted, by his appearance in the congregation, he would say, “*The Presbyterian form of church government is the only one appointed by Christ*,” while in his heart he would be an Independent.

Suppose again, he applies to Presbytery to be received as a student, or as a minister, but *on the same condition*, it is plain, from the reason already mentioned, they could not receive him. If he was not fit to be admitted to the communion table, much less is he to be admitted to the pulpit. To this every honest, intelligent Seceder will say, Amen. But what is this less than to say to him, you are not sent to preach *as you do it*. But I suspect, that not a few who would stanchly refuse this man admission into *their* pulpit, think no great harm to hear him sometimes in *his own*!

Again; if any minister in the Associate Synod should change from the sentiments upon which he was ordained and sent, and profess to be in favour of some new tenet, for example, *free communion*, or Watts’ Psalms, *he must* be suspended, and dealt with, and if he continue in his new sentiments, he must be deposed and cast out of

communion, for reasons in part the same, for which the other was refused admission into it.

It is true, indeed, that Seceders are reproached, generally, for their exercise of discipline to this effect, and yet it is equally certain, that all regular and consistent bodies act upon the same general principle. If they did not, they could not long maintain, in any degree, the ends of their association, or continue a distinct body. And some of them are, at this moment, paying dearly for their disregard of it.

I now proceed to offer a few remarks on the effect which the sentences of the church have.

And, *first*, I say, that when a minister is tried, convicted, and deposed, by the court of any true church, generally he is rightly deprived of his authority, and ought not to be reckoned a minister, or one sent. The Holy Spirit of Christ is pleased so to guide his servants in judgment, that this is generally the truth in the case. I fully admit, that all churches, and church-courts, are fallible; and that innumerable failings attach to their proceedings. But it must be carefully observed, that it is not *every thing* of this nature that affects the *validity* of their judgment. If the thing laid to the man's charge is really sensurable; if he is charged with preaching error; if he is a liar, a slanderer, or a drunkard; or is obstinate, and will not be reproved and brought to repentance; if he takes unlawful means to destroy the court that tries him; and the thing is certain, and clearly made out against him, by testimony or other evidence; then, whatever failing there may be on the part of the members of the court, though they may display an undue warmth, or in some things be irregular, their judgment must stand. What they have "bound on earth is bound in heaven." Their sentence has really and truly taken the man's authority to preach away; because, however they may have erred, in coming to this sentence, it is righteous in itself, and the thing that ought to be done. The church of Ephesus, Rev. ii. 4, is reprov'd for having "left her first love;" and this was such a failing, as would affect more or less all that she did, and, consequently, would have its influence on the members of her court, when they sat in judgment. Yet she is commended by the Lord for the sentence which she passed on some ministers—"And how thou canst not bear them which are evil; and hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars."

It is neither to be denied nor concealed that ecclesiastical courts have sometimes, either through ignorance, prejudice, or corruption, or all of these together, condemned the innocent, and acquitted the guilty. And when this is the case, their sentence may rightly be regarded, by all concerned, as null and void; and it is generally so very obvious, that none are in danger of being deceived, except those who are willing to be so. I need not go so far back, for an instance of this, as the anathemas of the Vatican upon the first reformers.

The Church of Scotland condemned and deposed the fathers of the Secession, (I believe she would this day be far from such a sentence,) for what was not a fault at all, but a most necessary duty; while she did allow the radical errors of Professor Simpson, and the blasphemies of Professor Campbell, to pass with very slight and inadequate censure. And both these cases have continued, to this

day, so clear, that none, who are willing to know the truth, can be at any loss to find it. The facts, in each case, were admitted on all hands. The General Assembly never denied the tenets of the two professors to be errors, and such as did unhinge the Christian faith. And Ebenezer Erskine and his brethren never denied the preaching of the sentiments laid to their charge, or that they meant in it to reprove the prevailing sin of patronage in the ruling party, so destructive to the church, and so dishonourable to her exalted head; and they speak for themselves. Equally plain were the grounds on which they refused to submit to the decisions of the Assembly, and to return afterwards when invited. They embrace the very grounds on which the Associate Church continues to stand as a distinct body at this day. Let no man call himself a Seceder, who either professes ignorance of them, or questions their validity. Therefore, although they were deposed by the ruling party in the General Assembly, they continued to claim and to exercise their ministerial authority; and their claim was admitted by a large body of the most serious, grave, and deliberate, both of the people and the ministers. And when a sensure of an ecclesiastical judicature cannot be submitted to without suppressing testimony against prevailing sins, or any sins, it ought not to be submitted to—"For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

But, on the other hand, people ought to beware of concluding, respecting any particular case, hastily. Because church courts are fallible, and have sometimes condemned the innocent, it would be false and unjust to say, *therefore*, they have done so in this case. Or, because the fathers of the Secession resisted the sentence passed on them as unjust and incompatible with their ordination vows, (in whose case it was true,) and were sustained, *therefore* it is true of *every sentence* that is resisted; and the person, or party, resisting it, is as righteous and innocent as they were. A case like theirs is a very rare occurrence.

First, They were men of unblemished morals. They abhorred lying. They did not slander their bitterest enemies. They did not take up or make false reports. They were far above the art of anonymous letters, or publishing ribaldish, anonymous pamphlets.

Secondly, They waited, in an orderly manner, upon the process of church courts, until their regular issue: although they knew, from the first, the justness of their cause, and the character of the court by whom they were to be tried; and, moreover, that a multitude of its members (namely, all the friends and abettors of patronage,) were deeply interested in their condemnation.

Thirdly, They stood manfully by the charge, which, in a respectful manner, they brought against the prevailing party. They shrunk neither from the proof nor the responsibility. And now, when it is a hundred years and more past, their statement of facts stands unconfuted.

And fourthly, they were slow, deliberate, and prayerful, in their seceding. They met for a length of time to confer together, and to seek Divine direction. It was in November, 1733, that they were deposed by the commission; but it was not till May 16, 1739, that they gave in *their Declinature*: that is, almost six years. The people who may be anxious to make out a parallel case, in some deposed favourite, never can succeed until they identify these points. They will do well, therefore, to *begin* with them.

When the question is put to the members of any ecclesiastical body, whether the sentence of the court ought to stop a minister from exercising his office, or whether it has really put him from his office?—(for sometimes this question will come up; sometimes the people have no adequate means of judging; sometimes they do not understand the transactions of the parties, nor their bearing; and sometimes no small pains are used to perplex the minds of plain people, and to bias their judgment;)—when the question comes up, it ought to be considered as a very grave matter, not to be hastily decided. It is important, in every point of view, that their judgment should be according to truth and righteousness; for if they sustain an unjust sentence on the one hand, they sustain a perversion of Christ's authority, which can operate, so far as it goes, only to the oppression of the innocent, the destruction of the church, and the dishonour of Christ. On the other hand, if they should oppose a just and righteous sentence, by countenancing a scandalous minister in his course, so far as their influence, and his together, extend, it goes to mislead the public mind—to countenance wickedness, under colour of zeal for pure religion—to support schism—and to prostrate all order in the church—and, I may also add, to perpetuate strife and animosity for generations. If church courts are fallible, and do often fail in matters of this kind, it ought to be remembered that the *people*, in judging for themselves, are not less so. It will not be thought by the attentive observer too much to say, that attachment to a minister, and sympathy for him in trouble, often carries the judgment away captive. Some people go to the opposite extreme, and decide with the multitude. Others are so sensitive, that they would decide almost any way that would make for an external peace. Not a few are determined by motives of interest. The main question with them is, how will it affect conveniency, property, and the purse? I need not say, that whoever is guided by any of these motives, he will, almost inevitably, throw his weight into the wrong scale. *He* is in no less danger of going wrong, who brings to the question a cold indifferent heart, or an ignorant mind. The decision of such may be deplored, but cannot be prevented by any thing short of the grace of God. But to the conscientious professor, on whom this painful duty, so common of late years, may devolve, I will say, seek earnestly the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Remember that church government and discipline are some “of the things of Christ,” which it is promised, “he shall show unto us.” Look for this guidance, first, and chiefly, through means of the word. Carefully review your profession, especially all those parts of it that bear upon government and discipline. Examine again the solemn promises made by ministers and elders at their ordination. Endeavour to obtain the highest kind of evidence of the truth of the facts, and of the merits of the case, and if possible be an eye and ear witness to the trial. Trust implicitly to no man's judgment, much less to the mere *ex parte* statements of the offender himself, who is under the strongest temptations to favour his own side. And then, even a heathen would advise you, in such a case, “to do nothing rashly.” Acts xix. 36. You may safely concede that the court has, most commonly, more opportunity of knowing the true state of the question than others. Neither will you hazard any thing by deferring your judgment until the whole trial be issued. I have never known a

person, who used these means, in any difficulty to know on which side truth and justice lay.

But I may suppose, that sometimes there may be honest people who have not all these means within their reach. Perhaps they live at a distance, or their occupation will not allow them the requisite time, or they hear so many different versions of the case, or their minds are entangled by their feelings, or, through misrepresentations and falsehoods, from quarters whence they cannot allow themselves to look for such things, the case appears to them so intricate and perplexed, that they are unable to decide; yet duty and spiritual interest both require that they *should* decide according to truth. Difficult as this may be, if in addition to the means that may be in their power, they attend diligently to the mark which Christ himself gives to detect false prophets, they may still be able to accomplish it. "Beware," says he, "of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. *Ye shall know them by their fruits.*" Mat. vii. 15, 16. I do not consider it improper to apply this to the case of a teacher who has been deposed from his office; for if righteously deposed, and yet persisting in teaching, what is he different from a false prophet? If unrighteously, and therefore no false prophet, the application of this test to him will only serve to make that truth more clear. While various classifications of the *fruits* in question might be given, we prefer to comprehend them all under *words* and *actions*, as it is by them that we are to be determined. With the motives and principles of the heart, any farther than they are identified with these, we have nothing to do. Setting aside then, for the present, court proceedings, let us attend to the *words* and *actions* of the deposed; the certainty of which may always, by a little pains, be known; and when known, they will enable the plain man, without any comment, to judge for himself pretty near the truth.

It is both necessary and proper, however, to take into the account the conduct of the accused while his trial is in progress, as well as after it. Because it often happens that his behaviour, at that time, alters the complexion of the case so much, that what was originally but a very small offence, meriting only the lightest admonition, becomes so great, by subsequent aggravations, that the very weightiest censure becomes indispensable. Every honest man must perceive, that when this is the case, it would be manifest injustice to the court to say they inflicted their weighty sentence upon the man merely for the offence in its original form. In order to arrive at the truth, you must add to it his subsequent denials, and prevarications; his justifications and repetitions of it; his injuries and his insults; his evasions, shifts, and artifices; his protests and declinations; and all this, that he may *not* confess what truly was a fault. This wickedness is, indeed, so startling in one who is called a minister, or in other words, an example of sobriety, righteousness, and godliness, that for a moment we distrust the evidence of our own senses, and question the *possibility* of it, and hastily conclude that there *must* be some other way of accounting for the facts. Here is the very point where many begin to stumble, very unjustly, at the court, and to fall victims to the most grievous deceptions. Now it is that a dense cloud begins to rise upon the whole case, which defies all human power to dissipate. But why? Is the human heart incapable of issuing such

things because the man is clothed with office? or is it more probable that the minds and sense of the *whole* court should be enchained by some illusion, than that *one* man should act according to our common nature? Have such things never happened in the history of official men, that we startle at it? Let us beware. We have come to the very confines of *skepticism*, which believes *nothing at all*, the moment that we decline to believe good and sufficient testimony. In viewing the man's subsequent conduct, it is necessary to take both a general and particular survey. He must be weighed in his *own* balance. If he claims to hold the position of an innocent man, who has been unjustly deposed, but who is so *obedient* to Christ and so *faithful* to his ordination vows, that he continues, in the face of all opposition, to exercise his office, let him be judged according to this. If this be truly his position, we shall find him more than ordinarily *humble and circumspect* in his walk, and *watchful* not to give the very least occasion of stumbling to any, and least of all to the court that deposed him, whom he aims to reclaim by his persevering steadfastness from their errors. He will be more zealous for the purity of the order, worship, and discipline, to which he vowed at his ordination, than ever. He will readily, and at once, acknowledge any slips which he may have made in the course of the trial, without limitation or reserve. He will show a forgiving spirit. And, although he is unjustly deposed, yet he will look upon it as a very heavy affliction sent upon him in God's holy providence, and carry himself accordingly. If these marks of honesty are found in him, in some good measure, those honest people to whom this is addressed may safely wait for more light, and they will not wait in vain. But if, instead of this, we see the man going in the face of truth, and persevering in his denial of facts incontestably proved, and find him trampling over the first principles of church government to sustain himself, they need no longer doubt. Does he break through all the rules of common decency to accomplish his ends? Does he welcome every fugitive from discipline, every apostate and miscreant that will ring all his changes? Does he lay himself out to work trouble to neighbouring congregations? Does he heap reproaches and slanders upon his brethren, without any advantage to his cause, real or apparent? We need no hesitate an instant, for the half of these things are enough to sustain his deposition as valid.

In a word, let the reader consider that when one is righteously deposed, God ordinarily leaves him to himself, and then he adopts some course, like the above, that plainly shows it.

ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΣ.

ART. V.—*Voluntary Associations.*

MR. EDITOR:—In your number for January you propose the following query:

"Have we any warrant from the word of God to form voluntary associations for the performance of social and moral duties which lie within the appropriate sphere of those civil and ecclesiastical institutions that are of divine appointment?"

This inquiry relates to an important practical matter, and deserves to be calmly and dispassionately considered. This I will endeavour

to do; and, if my remarks take the form somewhat of a criticism upon your own, I ask to be excused for two reasons: first, you have really presented the whole strength of the negative of this question; and, secondly, you have set an example of the right spirit of controversy.

Your argument is, summarily, this: "God has appointed institutions to accomplish the very objects contemplated by voluntary associations; to appoint, or form others, is a disparagement of the Almighty, and is prohibited." I think this is a fair statement of your general argument: to answer it is now my purpose; reserving a brief reply to your objections to the Anti-Slavery Society in particular, to the close of my communication.

The difficulty which many experience on this subject, I apprehend, arises from a double mistake as to matter of fact, as to the appropriate and *exclusive* sphere of civil and ecclesiastical institutions; and, as to the real aim and design of voluntary associations. Now, as to the first, civil government has been ordained of God, and ought to be set up by man, for the promotion of God's glory, and man's good, by the enacting of wholesome scriptural laws, and their faithful execution.

To make civil laws and execute them, is the business of rulers and magistrates *alone*. For any others to attempt this, is to disregard a divine ordinance. To administer the laws of the church's Head, to exercise church discipline, to preach the word, and to administer the sacraments, are duties devolving upon office-bearers in the church. For any voluntary association to take upon it such ecclesiastical affairs would be usurpation. Objectors do not certainly intend, being Protestants, and freemen, to enlarge the sphere of the *exclusive* rights and prerogatives of these divine institutions much beyond this. They will hardly consent to allow them the sole monopoly of uttering truth, reproofing sin, diffusing knowledge, &c., &c.

No one would be ready to say, that our information upon all or any important matters, doctrinal and practical, *must* come through the resolutions of an ecclesiastical tribunal, the mouth of a gospel minister, a president's message, or a congressional report! The intelligent editor of the Religious Monitor would not affirm that Bibles can be circulated lawfully *only* by church courts and officers; that *none* but civil and ecclesiastical officers have any right to circulate information on such a subject, for instance, as slavery. Rather than adopt such a doctrine, better by far have a censorship of the press at once. Such a principle would be binding us with a witness, to the chariot wheels of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny. But circulating Bibles is "a means of religious and moral improvement," and sounding an alarm on the subject of slavery may compel civil governors to change their course, or be driven from their stations by an indignant community.

It is not necessary to argue this farther. All must perceive that, while some duties belong *exclusively* to public officers, there is a large class which *may* be performed by them, but *may* also be performed by others.

But, it will be said, "Granted: individuals may do many things, such as those specified; but they may not associate together to do them." Why may they not? Scripture tells us, that, "two are better than one;" "and a three-fold cord is not quickly broken." If

I may buy and give away a Bible, it is really impossible for me to discover any reason why two, ten, or a hundred, may not pay over sums of money to me, to be expended for Bibles; these Bibles to be distributed according to the intention of the donors, and an account rendered to them how their business has been managed. If I may speak and print upon the subject of slavery, it is equally clear to me that I may call in the aid of two, ten, or a hundred, to assist me. Notwithstanding what appears in your magazine, I must still say, that it appears perfectly plain to me, that whatever an individual, *as such*, may do, individuals may associate to do. An individual, *as such*, may not enact laws, nor take upon him judicial or executive authority, in the state; nor preach, nor exercise government and discipline, in the church. Of course, to associate for any of these purposes, is treasonable, or revolutionary. An individual may buy and sell; may investigate truth; may publish truth; may warn his neighbours, and even the church and the state, of danger; may give them advice and counsel; may assist them in forming and accomplishing what may be, in its end, good, and, in its means, right. Is there any law to forbid union, for the better effecting of any of these objects? "Two are better than one."

It will be said, perhaps, "All this is not authority—not a divine warrant." The authority, the warrant, then, is in the law of our social nature. Man is weak; joined to his fellow, he becomes stronger: there is a principle implanted in his bosom by the hand of his Creator, that impels him to seek aid from others when he is unable to accomplish otherwise his ends; or can, in this way, accomplish them more readily. Let us take an example.—You have the right to publish "the Religious Monitor." It is a right that is so far from being derived from either civil or ecclesiastical authority, that you would not surrender it tamely at the call of either. Now, suppose that you hold the truth on some subject in morals or politics, which you wish to bring before the commonwealth, your faithfulness drives from you much of your present support. What is duty? To allow your periodical to drop, unless you can sustain it by your own resources, or to accept the proffered aid of others, like yourself, interested in the truth? What harm would there be, in such a case, in forming an association for the avowed object of sustaining you in your cause? None in the world. Were the subject, in the case supposed, Anti-Slavery, you would have around you an Anti-Slavery Society.

Is this all? Do they really design to do nothing more or less by these associations, than to bring truth before the public on topics that have an immediate bearing upon the public interests? * This I believe is all. And, until this is denied, I offer no proof. I am sure that those who are at all acquainted with the measures of the Anti-Slavery Society, (this I have chiefly in my eye,) will assent at once to this remark. The opponents of Slavery, who desire the immediate emancipation of these "poor oppressed," have established presses, and sent abroad lecturers; they have taken measures to collect information upon this subject, and to scatter it widely over the land. All this, as well as petitioning the higher powers, they might do as

* The Colonization Society and some Missionary Societies are exceptions. The former has for its object the transportation of coloured citizens, the latter sends out ministers. These I do not justify.

individuals, and encroach upon no right, no privilege, no prerogative, of either civil or ecclesiastical officers; and no reason can be given why they may not unite their efforts.

But still it is difficult to get rid of any misconception that has once taken possession of the mind; and the very simplicity of this whole matter, when looked at with an unblemished eye, is apt to generate a suspicion that, after all, there may be some undiscoverable point on which voluntary associations infringe upon divine ordinances. To my mind, however, it appears plain, that no doctrine which would not introduce as its *immediate* consequence all the tyrannical restraints upon individual action that ever tyranny or popery contained, can condemn associating, for good ends, in the use of means lawful to the individual as such.*

I will endeavour to remove any suspicion that may exist, by adverting to one or two principles, sometimes stated in reference to this subject.

It is said, in substance, that "the delinquency of public officers is not sufficient cause for undertaking their duties; but only for their removal." What is the principle of this remark? When we turn it round, I think we will find it to be, "that sacrifice is better than mercy!" There is some interest of morality, (which an individual can do something to promote,) such as the duty of emancipating bondmen, not only neglected, but absolutely opposed in the high places of power and influence in church and state. If those in office did their duty, it is admitted that there would be no occasion for the exertions of individuals in many cases where such occasion now exists. But delinquency proved to our satisfaction, what is to be done? Remove them, say some. Very well: let us begin. We must first convince the majority that they are delinquent. Ah! true. How is that to be done? Why, it must be by spreading the matter on which they are delinquent before their constituents, and then by convincing more than half of them that their public course is wrong. But how is that to be done? For my part, says the projector of reform, I know no other way than to put our shoulders to and push altogether, that we may set the ball rolling. But will not that be a voluntary association? True; and what else can be done?

So much for state officers: let us try the Church. Here we have all other circumstances just as in the state: we must argue, and, if we can, persuade. And, besides, the additional circumstance that these officers are in for life. What then? Nothing for it but to do our best to persuade them of their error, or, for the sake of the prerogatives of delinquent public officers, permit darkness to reign, and the interests of morality to be trampled under foot. I ask—does any objector believe that the Almighty puts more honour upon positive institutions than upon his moral law; and that he requires us to do so? That he esteems it a sin in any of the community, or laity, to effect that moral end, and to publish that truth, which rulers would neglect or hide? And here I remark again,—this objection takes for granted, what has already been referred to, that to promote morality, by *any* means, is the duty and right of rulers ex-

* The case of individual delinquency is not presented here; but of great, and general national or ecclesiastical neglect of some part of moral duty; such as in reference to slavery in the United States.

*clusively.** Now, while I believe that it is their right and duty, I know it is not theirs to the *exclusion* of all action by all others. Let this last remark be dwelt upon; for it is, in fact, the hinge of this whole controversy. Rulers have had committed to them the interests of morality and religion. Granted; but to affirm that to them *solely* are these interests intrusted, would be going a little farther than most tyrants have gone, and about as far as the pope would ask any one to go. And, moreover, it must be remembered, that it is not to any *abstractions*, called civil and ecclesiastical institutions, that these great interests must be affirmed to be committed *entirely*, if the anti-association doctrine be true, but to the *officers* who administer these institutions. Fix your attention on this point.

Some, who have no scruples respecting the principle of these societies, may have a fear hanging about them, that, by their magnitude, their activity, their zeal, and efficiency, they may, in fact, come to fill the place in the mind and heart, that should be reserved for God's ordinances. This is a suspicion which I would treat with respect, and handle with due caution; and yet I am fully convinced, that it is entirely groundless. As to civil government, while it performs its duties with any measure of wisdom and diligence, office has so many charms, and, moreover, civil enactments being fortified by penal sanctions, it is in little danger of falling into disrepute: the danger is, that even bad governments will hardly ever want many flatterers. As to the church, (and it is for the church that these fears principally arise,) the same remark holds good. Let the gospel ministry but do their duty faithfully, and go before the people in the course of reform, and it is difficult to conceive that they should fall into the background compared with any association. The church lays hold of every moral and religious interest, when she is in the way of her duty, and carries them on together. We might as well be afraid that the light of the stars would rival that of the sun. If the church neglects her duty, and puts herself, as, alas! in many of her branches, she is now doing, against the interests of morality, I can entertain but little sympathy for any loss of reputation and influence she may experience.

I omit the remarks on the subject of the Anti-Slavery Society, with which I had intended to close this communication, as it has already grown to too great a size; and merely observe, that, while I defend what I believe to be a lawful mode of doing good, I long for the time when voluntary associations will be unnecessary, when civil rulers shall all rule righteously, according to the scriptures, and when Zion shall be a united and quiet habitation. This time will never come, I am well assured, until "the oppressor shall cease from the land," and that blessed gospel, which "proclaims liberty to the captive," shall be acknowledged as the *only* gospel. B.

ART. VI.—*The Minister wholly in his Work, by the Rev. Dr. Woods.*

How often do we hear it said, and said truly, at the present day, that *the ministry is not duly respected!* And have we not here one

* As to what belongs to rulers exclusively, such as enacting laws, &c., I do not now refer to it; nor is it called for in this part of the discussion.

of the causes of this? *Ministers have not kept in their place.* They have more or less neglected their sacred trust, and gone into other employments. This has opened the door for other men to thrust themselves into *their* place, and assume *their* office. Is not this one of the reasons, that the sacred office has lost so much of its sacredness? Open your eyes, brethren, and see how the enclosures of the ministerial office are broken down, and (I am sorry to say it)—broken down chiefly by ministers themselves; so broken down that no one can find the line of separation between the ministry and secular employments! And who of you, brethren, are prepared to meet the natural consequences of this?—Who of you are willing that every one called an *evangelist*, and every one called a *lecturer*,—that every man and woman, who are puffed up with pride and self-sufficiency, should thrust themselves into your pulpit, and assume the work or any part of the work of moral and religious instruction, which belongs to you?

You see, that the principle above stated is one of special moment, and that consequences of no ordinary importance hang upon it. Let this principle then, with its obvious bearings, be stated again, that it may be well fixed in our minds. Our powers of thought and action are all limited; so that we cannot, if we would, do every thing; and we can do only a few things well. Of course, there must be a division of labour; and in order to make the division advantageous, the bounds of each department of labour must be definitely settled. This being done, those who go into the ministry ought scrupulously to confine themselves within the just bounds of their office, and to lay out their time and strength upon their appropriate duties. If we would do the work of the ministry in the best manner we are capable of, we must abstain from all other employments that would interfere with it. We are bound to do this, whether the work, in itself, is considered to be of more or less value. If it has such a *degree* of importance, that it ought to be *done*, and if God *commands* it to be done, and to be done by *us*, we should devote ourselves to its accomplishment, even though there might be other employments, which, in themselves, are of higher value. How exceedingly strong then is the obligation which holds us to our appropriate work, when we take into view its superior value and excellence! In the judgment of God, angels, and men, it involves interests of supreme importance. No other office is conversant with objects of such magnitude, or has so direct a bearing upon the present and future welfare of the world. If our sacred work were destitute of attractions,—or if it were possessed of only an inferior degree of intrinsic value;—then, though we should be bound to pursue it as a matter of *duty*—it would be in the way of submission and self-denial. But what shall we say when we consider the paramount value and excellence of the work, its exalted honours, and its many powerful attractions,—a work in which we co-operate with angels, and the Lord of angels! In this view it is the object of our deliberate *choice*, and our cordial *attachment*. It comes indeed to our conscience with its solemn *obligations*; but it comes to our *heart* with its divine *charms*. We embrace it as a precious privilege; and we find it a source of pure, unearthly pleasure. We would gladly engage in the work, if *permitted*, though not *commanded* to do it. True, it puts a yoke upon us, but the

yoke is easy; a burden, but the burden is light. If then we *might* leave our sacred work for some other, how could we make such a sacrifice? Who would willingly descend from a higher to a lower employment?—Who would willingly practise such self-denial, as to give up, even for a time, the blessed, honourable business of a gospel minister for any other business which can be named, or for any place which the world can offer! Other works, I admit, are honourable. But how much more honourable is this? The throne of a king is a *high* place, but how much *higher* is the *pulpit*!

But the precept of the apostle in the text, which is at all times important, seems to be specially seasonable and necessary at the present day. A great variety of objects have, in every age, tempted ministers to turn off their attention from their proper work to other employments. But there are more than common, at this day. It is impossible to count up the multitude of objects and interests, some of which are wonderfully exciting, that solicit a minister to transgress the limits of his calling, and to engage in employments which do not belong to the sacred office,—and some of them do not belong any where. There is no end to the solicitations of this kind which work upon a minister. And they are the more apt to prevail, because they are addressed to him under the *appearance*, and sometimes with the *real feeling* of benevolence and piety.—Now if a minister yield to solicitations of this kind, how often will his mind be divided and his attention be turned off from his proper work! The utmost watchfulness, resolution, and fixedness of purpose will be necessary to keep ministers within their own province, and prevent them from passing over, in one way or another, the appointed boundaries of their office. And such watchfulness and resolution are the more necessary, because, as I said before, the fences are broken down, and you can scarcely see where they were; and because the temptation which will arise to draw you aside, will attack you frequently, and very artfully, and with great urgency, and with the authority of great names. And you will find, brethren, that a very strict, uniform, inflexible adherence to your proper work is indispensable, because your yielding even once, though in a small degree, will naturally lead on to other and wider deviations. Give yourself then to your holy calling. And let not any ambitious aspiring in your own breast, or the spirit of controversy and strife, which is abroad in the world, or even the spirit of benevolence and piety, lead you astray. Pray, what have you to do with the thousand speculations, disputes, strifes of words, jealousies and ambitious projects, which mark the present era? Respecting all these, your Lord says: "*What are they to thee? Follow thou me.*"—*Give thyself wholly to thy proper work, and leave other works to fall into other hands, or to fall to the ground, as divine wisdom shall direct.*

ART. VII.—*Essay on Family Worship.*

By the Rev. W. H. Burns, of Kilsyth.

PART III. ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS.

THE first is, that there is no express command in Scripture to the effect that each day, and twice each day, the head of the family should assemble its members for social worship. The answer will

be found in the arguments set forth in the first part, which must be answered, and found irrelevant, ere this objection can be sustained. The arguments are, that family worship is founded in man's social and domestic relationship; that it is implied in many scriptural injunctions; that the prayer usually called the Lord's prayer, expressly adapted for social and daily use, authorizes family prayer; and that the examples *approved* in Scripture have the force of a law, which examples have been followed by the pious and consistent members of the church, down to the present times. And now, would it, let me ask, be lawful or safe for any Christian head of a family to gainsay these arguments, and to take up the cause of those who neglect systematically the performance of this duty?

Another objection is, that every one in the situation of a head of a family is not qualified to discharge the duty properly; and that it is better that each member should in secret attend to devotional duties, than that the head of the family, who may be less qualified than several of the members, should be the conductor of their joint devotions. To this the answer is, 1st, that gifts improve by exercise; 2d, that a chaplain or substitute, qualified properly, is, by the reason of the thing, and expressly by a law of our church, allowed to take this delegated duty or place of the head of the family; and, 3dly, that excellent forms are to be obtained, and in great variety, which may be very lawfully, yea, edifyingly and profitably used, until the disqualification, whether real or only feared, may be removed. At any rate, nothing surely can be said of validity against the use of such sound devotional manuals, rather than that the duty should be neglected, or unsuitably performed.

Another objection to the *every-day* family worship is, that it is apt from frequent occurrence, to become formal, or at any rate, to lose somewhat of that solemnity which impresses the hearers. We answer, that this proves too much to be safely regarded as a valid argument. Upon the same principle the public acknowledgment of God at our meals, would require to be laid aside as of too frequent recurrence; all religious conversation would be discarded as making sacred things too common; "pray without ceasing," "seven times a day do I praise thee," &c., would be set aside as encouraging irreverence; whereas the Bible teaches us to *walk* with God, and in all our ways to acknowledge Him. The realizing the divine presence habitually, the cultivation and the exercise of a devotional spirit and language, are plainly and undeniably more scriptural means of correcting and counteracting irreverence than *infrequency* in religious exercises. In all cases, doubtless, formality and every degree of irreverence is to be watched or *prayed* against; the Bible should be read, and prayer uttered with much solemnity. In all this, wisdom and grace are most profitable to direct; and the head of the family, as well as the members, should earnestly seek grace whereby to serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. The great rule in all is, "be in earnest."

A fourth objection is, though not avowed, that it is too rigid and strict a practice to be carried through; it may do on a Sabbath ("of a Sunday,") or on occasions when there is sickness in the house; but really to have it every day, still more to have prayer morning and evening, savours of puritanical or methodistical preciseness. Now this is just the opposition of the carnal mind to every thing that is

spiritual; it is just as much as saying that religion is a severe yoke, that its services are a weariness, that they impose too great a restraint upon the *freedom of life* and of *hours*. On such as feel or express themselves thus, we have to press the previous question, Do you believe the gospel? we must address the call to the unconverted, "Marvel not that it is said unto you, Ye must be born again." You may indeed submit to the kind of religion described in a *certain Manual* of the morning and evening sacrifice, a kind of sentimental piety which has no foundation in genuine conversion, or the precious faith of God's elect; but you have need yet to begin at the beginning of the Christian life.

Another objection to regular family worship, akin to the former, is, that it is not easy to observe so uniformly the rules of strict sobriety of practice as to maintain consistency, and so as not to bring a reproach upon religion, as too many have done. Now this just resolves itself into the same objection as the last noticed. It is most certain that, as one quaintly but tersely expresses it, "praying must make you give over sinning, or sinning will make you give over praying." The shocking practice of so conducting the rites of hospitality as to make it almost out of the question that the host should keep himself within the mark of sobriety, is now happily obsoleting. It is not, as in days gone by, considered to be indispensable that the entertainer and his guests should be intoxicated before parting; and so to be unfitted for female society, and for all rational as well as religious duties. It is scarcely credible now that this was the practice quite current in the days not long gone by. But let all sinful practices be abandoned, let the life and conversation be such as becomes the gospel; and, O, do not shut out from the circle of duties and of privileges the truly delightful and profitable exercise of family worship.

I am not aware of any other objection being urged, and these we think are satisfactorily answered. Still we fear that indolence or false shame, or worldly conformity, or some other of the evil principles or practices which operate powerfully in opposition to the interests of the kingdom of light, will keep too many from engaging in the service we have been recommending. I will conclude by referring to an anecdote of Mr. Hervey, or of G. Whitefield. A lady asked the question, May I not be a Christian, and yet go now and then to the theatre, or an assembly? the answer was, "Madam, get converted, and then ask the question." So would we say to the head of a family who should ask, "May I not be a Christian, and yet want family worship?" "Get converted, and then ask the question." At all events, the words of our Lord seem to be powerfully applicable to such as neglect, through false shame, this most incumbent duty. "Whosoever is ashamed of me or of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will I be ashamed before my Father, and his holy angels."

If from any sinful indulgence you cannot consistently keep up the worship of God, then on you the dreadful sentence is announced, "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity; I know you not."

But yet there is room for repentance. O turn, turn, and live. "Behold he prayeth!"

[From the Edinburgh Christian Instructor.]

ART. VIII.—*Essay on Christian Watchfulness.* (PART II.)

IN entering on this part of the essay, I would just hint at two or three of the qualities which ought always to characterize watchfulness. For example, watchfulness should be *strict*, and not of a *general* indefinite kind, which has neither place, nor precise and definite aim:—*constant*, and not every now and then intermitted, like the conduct of the tradesman who, it may be, for a succession of weeks will labour assiduously, and then relax, and lose almost the whole of his gains by rambling. What kind of sentinel is he who is only now and then at his post?—Watchfulness should also be universal, that is, we are to watch *in all things*, as saith the apostle to Timothy, at every entry, and against every ambush, and to seize every opportunity of doing good.

There is such a thing as watching against some *one* evil, or some *one* enemy, or snare, while others are allowed to escape. One door left open is enough, although all the rest were shut, to admit a host of enemies. Watch therefore in all things, against every sin, and snare, and evil work: for example, watch against *pride*, as well as *covetousness*: against omission of duty, as well as *commission of sin*: against first and second table transgressions: against *week day*, as well as sabbath day vanity: against injuring yourself as well as hurting your neighbour. Watch when abroad, as well as at home; and watch in your own family and in secret, as well as when many eyes are upon you. Keep guard at every avenue—at all the five senses, and likewise, and above all keeping, “keep the heart, out of which *are the issues* of life.”

First, Watchfulness is the command of our great Lord and Master, frequently and powerfully repeated.

I do not know any duty more frequently pressed upon all the servants of Christ by their Master, than this, and especially towards the close of his ministry; and by the apostles, Paul and Peter, and in the Apocalypse of John the divine, it is most powerfully and affectionately enforced.

It is not then, by men like ourselves merely, (although they are commanded to watch for our souls) nor by angels, who are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation; but by the Lord of all “whose we are,” by our Master, and Friend, and Shepherd. It is his frequent, and loud, and earnest charge, “Watch,” “be ye ready,” “Watch and pray.” And what is the design of all the means of grace, and of all the divine dealings with us, and of all the changes and trials with which we are visited, but to be so many charges to watch?

Again, *Watch*, for your enemies are numerous. You are not yet arrived at the land of rest; you are in an enemy’s country. You cannot safely lay aside your armour, but are still to watch. It would not be safe or wise in you to sleep while your enemies are lively. Your adversary, “the devil, goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour; therefore be sober, be vigilant.”

The world is also inimical in its friendships, as well as its enmities: its blandishments, still more than its frowns: its successes, as well as its disappointments. Its joys and its cares are each and all of them, calls to watch and to pray. Besides all this, and more than all this, we carry an enemy within—a bosom foe, much more dangerous

than all the rest. O then watch and pray, and be sober. Fight, and *agonize* to enter in at the strait gate.

Farther:—You have many eyes upon you. The omniscient eye which searches the heart and the reins: the vigilant and malignant eye of Satan: the envious evil eye of many who curiously observe and watch for your halting; and the eye of your own conscience, which none of your actions can escape, unless through the most deplorable and dangerous somnolence, the image of spiritual death. You are surrounded, too, with a great cloud of witnesses; therefore watch.

I would suggest a motive of another kind; it is that of the apostle to the Thessalonians, (1 Thes. v. 8.) “Therefore let us not sleep as do others, but watch,” &c. It is indeed but too common to make this an argument to ease and relaxation. Others are indulging themselves, and taking their rest; and why should not we? Why be singular? why morose? why so serious? But such language does not at all comport with the character and profession of Christians. It is a virtual denial of the faith. It is a laying down of your colours as soldiers of Christ, to make what others do our rule. Beware of this *neighbour-like*. “I must have my daughters to the sacrament, that they may be like other folk,” said a mother once; to which a godly man replied, “O woman, they will be too *like other folk*, and *that will be their loss*.” You must be of another spirit; exemplary: not only in decency, but in *liveliness and watchfulness*, against not only the grosser, but also the more specious practices of professors and of the world. You have perhaps read or heard of a reply of Walsingham, the famous secretary of Queen Elizabeth, when rallied for his want of gaiety in former days, “All is serious around me: God in calling to repentance; the Lord Jesus Christ in inviting to come to him; the Holy Spirit in striving with us, and wooing us to the paths of peace; the great adversary is earnest to ruin us, as Christ’s ministers are to save us; all in heaven, and all in hell are serious; why then should I be gay?”

And so we may truly say—heaven, earth, and hell are awake and active, why then should we be sleeping, *we* who profess to belong to the living army of the faithful?

Again, Be exhorted to watch, for many have suffered for want of it: witness Lot both in his going into Sodom, looking no farther than its sweet, well-watered vale; and on his going out of it, when he lost so much, and incurred farther guilt. Witness Sampson, the strongest of men, made weak and like other men, through want of watchfulness. Witness Simon Peter in going into the high priest’s hall, and in the company of enemies of his Lord, shamefully denying him. The list, alas! is numerous in every age of those who have fallen altogether; or greatly impaired their strength, and usefulness, and comfort, through defect of watchfulness.

And is not this also an argument that you yourselves have lost much time, and much good, through the same guilty cause? And surely these words (1 Peter iv. 4,) are most salutary, and most reasonable; the past of life is more than sufficient to have wrought the will of the flesh; to have prosecuted a careless and self-indulgent course. O let the short remains be vigilantly and earnestly improved! But,

There is one argument which is more than all others urged by
VOL. XVI.—42

our blessed Lord, and that is, his own second coming, *certain, near*, and yet neither the day nor the hour known to any. "Watch, therefore, for you know not when the Master of the house cometh, whether in the evening, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning, lest coming suddenly, he find you sleeping."*

Finally, By every thing around us, and within, and about us, we are exhorted to watch: by every beating pulse; by all the dangers which surround us, (and they are many, *seen* and *unseen*, *corporeal* and *spiritual*;) by every tolling bell, and opening grave: by every returning day, and every closing night; the entering on the active scenes of the one; and the unseen dangers of the other. Every morning we are called to watch, that we lose not our time and opportunity of serving God and our generation: and every evening, lest we sleep the sleep of death. In short, it may be said of watchfulness, as of prayer, that there is every argument *for it* and none against it; that there is no time, no place, nor season in which it would be unsuitable or superfluous to exercise watchfulness. If it was necessary even in paradise, surely there is no scene, however sweet, or still, or sheltered, in which it is unnecessary. In the church, and in the market; going on, or resting; preaching or hearing, or praying, or working, or buying, or selling, conversing with God or with man, we are ever to be watchful, for every where there are calls to listen to, and snares to be avoided. Till we enter heaven's gate and the rest which remaineth for the people of God, we must *watch*.

W. H. B.

ART. IX.—*Popery in Philadelphia.*

"He shall speak great words against the Most High,—and think to CHANGE TIMES AND LAWS," DAN. vii. 25.

THE history of Popery is written in the prophetic writings of the Old and New Testament. The exact fulfilment of prophecy in the history of our Lord and his apostles, and in the dispersion and continued existence of the Jews as a distinct people, is regarded as indubitable testimony to the truth of divine revelation; but, to this evidence should be added the continued existence of Popery. It is equally unequivocal and striking. Prophecy reflects the image of Popery no less truly than a mirror the features of the human face. An incident recently occurred in this city,† amounting to an exact fulfilment of the text standing at the head of this article, which is referred to only as a small item of that flood of evidence which has, from time to time, been placed before the public, and which demonstrates the Romish Church to be the BLASPHEMOUS

* The allusions to the uncertain time of a master's return, and the celebration of marriages at night, and the arrival with torch-lights, and the loud summons at the actual moment of the bridegroom's coming, are circumstances familiar to the readers of the New Testament. Let us not dismiss the subject as merely illustrating eastern customs, but learn the *great*, the *serious lesson*,—to be girded with truth, and to have the lamp burning, so as to be ready for the coming of our Lord. Watch *therefore*.

† See *Public Ledger*, January 11th, and 14th, 1840.

MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND OF ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. Happy would it be for our countrymen, did they more generally examine the evidence on which this assertion rests.

The facts of the case alluded to are briefly these:

About two years ago, John Cassidy was married to Mary M'Shane by Bishop Kenrick, of the Catholic Church; Cassidy, who was a Protestant, resisted the entreaties of his wife, who belonged to the Catholic Church, to attend service at the latter church, and become a convert to the faith which she professed. She applied to the bishop for advice, who, as she declares, represented to her that, as they were first cousins, and had contracted marriage without the necessary dispensation, the marriage was invalid, according to the laws of that church, and drew up a paper to that effect, which she called a divorce, signed with his name, as follows:

"Mary M'Shane states that she is the first cousin of John Cassidy, with whom she contracted marriage without the necessary dispensation, which marriage is invalid, according to the laws of the Catholic Church.

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,
Bishop, &c."

Philadelphia, Jan. 7, 1840.

He told her that she committed a sin by living with him any longer, and her child was a bastard, and all their children would be such. The wife, therefore, left her husband, taking her child with her. On Thursday, her husband was arrested on a charge of abandoning her child, and brought before an alderman. The husband, of course, denied the charge, and asserted his willingness to maintain them both; but that she had left him without sufficient cause, and, until she returned again, he did not think himself bound to maintain them. The magistrate, on hearing the evidence in this singular case, advised her to go home and live with her husband—that they had been legally married, according to the laws of the country, and no bishop had power to divorce them—and that, if she were to contract marriage again, during the lifetime of her present husband, she would be liable to imprisonment for bigamy. She would not consent, however, to live with him, after what the bishop had said, but agreed to deliver the child to her husband's keeping, who readily consented to take it, and the parties then left the office, each to their separate homes.

The editor of the *Ledger* regarded this transaction as "an unwarrantable interference between man and wife, and an attempt to set the laws of the church above the laws of the land." This remark called forth the following note from the bishop, which the editor seems very meekly and complacently to think "will have a tendency to correct any misapprehension which may have existed concerning the matter."

To the Editors of the Public Ledger:

DEAR SIR:—A friend has just handed me your paper, in which my name is introduced in reference to a case lately brought before a justice of the peace. As he informs me you professed your willingness to correct any mistake which the statement may contain, I beg leave to state that, as far as I am concerned, the matter is a mere affair of conscience, on which my advice and instructions were solicited. The parties are, I believe, both professors of the Catholic faith, though the man is said to pay no regard to its practical duties. The laws of the Catholic Church forbid marriage within certain degrees of kindred, and any marriages contracted by Catholics within those degrees, without a dispensation from the ecclesiastical authority, are considered as of no force in the ecclesiastical forum. The parties in question neglected to seek that dispensation, having concealed the fact of their relationship.

Shortly after the marriage, the conscience of the woman being disturbed, she applied to me, when I offered to grant the necessary dispensation for the relief of her conscience, if she could induce the man to come forward. After a long interval she returned, declaring her fixed determination to live with him no longer, when I again offered the dispensation. She said he would not believe her assertion that the impediment existed, unless I gave it under my hand. This is the whole of the affair, which is purely a matter of conscience.

Yours, respectfully,

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,
Bishop, &c.

Philadelphia, Jan. 13, 1840.

This incident is quoted, as already intimated, to illustrate the fulfilment of the text in Dan. vii. 25: *He shall think to change laws.*

1. *The laws of the Catholic church forbid the marriage of first cousins.* The word of God contains no such law. "Even as the Lord commanded Moses, so did the daughters of Zelophehad; for they were married unto their father's brother's sons," Num. xxxvi. 10, 11.* "The only *collateral* relations, which are forbidden to marry, are brothers and sisters, by whole or half blood, or by affinity legitimate or illegitimate."† *He shall think to change laws.*

2. *Without a dispensation from the ecclesiastical authority, are considered of no force in the ecclesiastical forum.*" It seems then that this law, which has deprived a man of his lawful wife, and a child of the affection and care of its own mother, can be dispensed with either before or after the consummation of the marriage contract; and all that is requisite for the attainment of this object is a little money placed in the bishop's hand! Thus, while this "mother of harlots" makes laws contrary to the laws of the God of heaven, for money, she also claims and exercises the power to *dispense* with those laws, concerning which the Son of God has said, "Till heaven and earth pass away, not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled."‡ Yes, money will procure from the Church of Rome a *dispensation* for perjury, adultery, incest, criminal abortion, and murder; but the want thereof shall disturb the peace of families, defy the righteous laws of the land, and pluck asunder those whom God has joined! *He shall think to change laws.*

3. *But it was a mere affair of conscience, purely a matter of conscience.* So it seems the *conscience* of the bishop dictated to him to nullify the marriage relation, in defiance of the laws of God and man. The conscience of a Romish priest is the most curious phenomenon in nature. It dictates celibacy; and, for money, concubinage, breach of vows, murder, sedition, and blasphemy! But are we, in the United States, to suffer our laws, our social and domestic relations, to be trampled upon with impunity, merely to gratify the consciences of the Romish priesthood, the sworn vassals of a foreign power? We should like to see this question started before our civil tribunals; and hope, therefore, that the man, whose temporal happiness has been sacrificed by Bishop KENRICK's conscience, will resort to the laws of his country for redress. If he has not the pecuniary means, will not some of our public spirited gentlemen of the bar step forward to his relief? If not, those who feel interested in preserving the marriage relation inviolable, should contribute a sum sufficient to defray the expenses of a suit. Will

* The Papists have no right to plead that this was a *Jewish* law; for their whole system of priesthood, so far as it has any foundation, rests on the abrogated ritual of the Jews.

† Scott on Lev. xviii. 6—18.

‡ See the *Tuzæ Chancellariæ* in our last number.

not the editor of the *Ledger* notice this subject? Or is he *entirely* satisfied with the bishop's explanation? Or, like most of our editors, has he too many Roman Catholic subscribers to undertake such a hazardous enterprise?

By disregarding the law of the land, the bishop has shown himself a worthy son of the Romish Church. For it is an authoritative doctrine of that church, that papal ecclesiastics are not subject to civil laws. "The clergy are not subject to the laity, not even to the king." *Panormitan.* ad Dict. Cap. Sollicitæ. "The person of every clergyman is sacred, so that he cannot be subject to any secular power." *Cajetan.* "Kings have no coercive power over ecclesiastics." *Colleg. Bononiensis* Respons. pro libertat Eccles. Sect. 21, 46. These, and many other similar sentiments, are selected by McGavin from laws, bulls, decretals, &c., enacted by councils, and sanctioned by popes, whose infallibility Bishop Kenrick will hardly venture to deny.

The poor woman is, therefore, less criminal than the bishop; for her conscience depended entirely on his, on the pain of forfeiting her privilege to absolution, and extreme unction, without which there is no salvation for a papist. She supposed, according to the bishop's instructions, that she had no alternative but to choose between her husband and the salvation of her soul; both she could not possess. And this affair is not a new thing with papists. About twenty years since, a papist, who had married a protestant wife in Glasgow, resolved to convert her to the faith. Having failed in this attempt he abandoned her, with a view of going to Ireland; he did not, however, live to reach the place of his destination, and the following is a copy of a letter found upon him after death:

"Glasgow, Dec. 5th, 1818.

DEAR MARGARET:—This comes to let you know that I am left this place, and gone to Ireland. You have yourself to blame in this, for if ever I was determined to go to the devil for any woman living, I would do it for your sake. Dear Margaret, I am very sorry you stand so much in your own light, as not till agree to my principles, for you said you would not never turn from your ways of thinking, so by that means you and I shall never agree. So therefore I bid you adieu, dear Margaret, for evermore across the main you need never look for me in Scotland again. As I said before, I will never send my soul to the devil for you or any other woman. I sincerely give my blessing to your son James. No more at present, but farewell for ever."

Some of our readers will, probably, think we have devoted too much room to the case of an obscure individual; but it illustrates one of the many abominations of Popery. Neither is it probable this notice will fall into the hands of those who have the greatest necessity for reading it; but it seems a duty to keep such things before the few that do read and reflect. All the superstition, ignorance, and cruelty, of which the Romish priesthood are now, and have so long been, the guilty authors, will probably soon be re-enacted in this country, especially in our large cities, in all their repulsive deformity.

Our political papers abound with complimentary notices, and indirect commendations of the doings of papists; and should an article be offered with the benevolent intention of disabusing the public mind, and exposing their solemn fooleries, so destructive alike to the temporal and eternal interests of our fellow men,—*they cannot admit religious controversy into their columns!*

Perhaps, as a general rule, it is not desirable they should engage in religious controversy; but we deny their right to poison the public mind, by their apologies for popery, frequently accompanied with implied, if not expressed reflections, disparaging to the Protestant religion. This cringing, fawning disposition, manifested so frequently towards the Romish priesthood, is conclusive evidence that the word of God is but little read, and less understood, by the great mass of our countrymen. But we know the days of Popery are numbered, and this shall be our consolation. After one more brief triumph, this mystical Babylon shall go down like lead in the mighty waters, to rise no more. For he who says, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure," hath spoken it.

ART. X.—*To Correspondents.*

THE attention of the critical reader is directed to the first article of the present number. It appears to us a satisfactory solution of a difficulty that has long been a source of perplexity to the Biblical student.

"*HESPERUS*," and "Farther Remarks on Societyism," in the next number.

Our Anti-Slavery friends must bear with us. We cannot possibly find room for one half the articles which have been received on that subject. If all were published, they would fill our pages to the exclusion of every thing else. This would not only defeat the design of the writers, but destroy the Monitor. They shall receive their full share of room and attention. We have been reluctantly compelled to omit the extracts from the Rev. J. Patterson's address, which had been marked for the present number. In the next number we design to give, though lengthy, the Address of the Committee of Synod on this subject entire, that our readers may have the whole of this able paper before them at once. It will supersede the necessity of publishing many other articles. The recent numerous demonstrations of the ferocious spirit of slavery, both in the church and in the world, both within and without the halls of legislation, ("they speak wickedly concerning oppression,") has roused a spirit in the Secession Church that speaks well for her piety and patriotism. In this she may anticipate no small share of obloquy; but our God abhors the oppressor, and will make his punish-

ment wonderful. "He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker." "Behold the tears of such as are oppressed, they have no comforter! On the side of their oppressors is power, but they have no comforter!" But what of all this? Shall the poor bow down the neck always? Shall the cry of millions of the human race created in the image of God never be heard in heaven? Shall the Book of life be for ever withheld from these immortal souls? This cannot be. "Cursed be he that maketh the blind to wander out of the way. And all the people shall say, Amen." Wo to this land! for "she is wholly oppression in the midst of her." Again we say, and not we, but the Spirit of the living God, Wo to this land! Pride and avarice are the passions that feed and fatten without restraint on the tears and groans and innocent blood of the defenceless! In connexion with which, the beastly lusts of drunkenness, gluttony, and uncleanness, are rampant in the land!

We are pleased with the article of B. It is ingenious, and in the right spirit. We have not room for a formal reply. As the question is admitted to be "an important practical matter," it is hoped our correspondents will probe it to the bottom; that love may be the impelling power, the glory of God and good of men the object, and truth the victor. The advocates of voluntary associations appear resolved to meet the question candidly and manfully; the objectors, therefore, must also take the field, or surrender at discretion. We give no pledge to sustain the negative single-handed. We can, however, by no means concede, that "the whole strength of the negative of this question" was presented in the few hints thrown out by us, chiefly with the design of leading to profitable discussion. But we must content ourselves at present with a few brief observations without attempting to illustrate. And,

1. Our query is not limited to "officers, nor "to any *abstractions* called civil and ecclesiastical institutions." Its language embraces these institutions as substantial existences, possessing both "a name" and "a local habitation." It supposes bodies legally and perfectly organized in all their parts, moving onward under a divine charter, by which they exist as public bodies, the end of whose association is instruction in the knowledge and mutual assistance in the practice of all the social, relative, and moral duties connected with their temporal and spiritual interests. It supposes, farther, that superiors, inferiors, and equals, are alike subject to their constitutional law. That certain duties belong *exclusively* to the head, hands, or feet of these bodies, and certain others in common to the whole body; which embrace every thing proposed to be done by voluntary associations. It is not supposed the head can say to the feet, "I have no need of you." Consequently, "the great interests of these institutions are not committed *entirely* to the *officers* who administer them." Here, then, we discover the Divine goodness

and condescension in giving us institutions adapted to "the law of our social nature," which B. makes the warrant for voluntary associations. We also discover the true import of the Divine maxim, "Two are better than one."

2. Respecting the Bible Society, so far as relates to the multiplication and distribution of copies of the scriptures, it clearly comes under our second classification; but we are by no means certain that its existence is necessary. Both the British and American Bible Societies have been greatly abused. To say nothing of the large sums expended on buildings, officers, agents, &c., the money of the Christian people has been misapplied to the publication of Apocryphal books, while a metrical version of the inspired Psalms has been excluded. Thus they have given countenance to Romish superstition, and thrown the whole weight of their gigantic influence into the scales against a pure dispensation of gospel ordinances, while they stand before the community the violators of the hallowed precepts of that Book which they are so zealous to place in the hands of others! What is likely to be, nay, what has been, the moral influence of their example upon the church, and upon those who have received the scriptures at their hand? Can the authority of the Bible be supposed to bind the consciences of the ignorant, the indifferent, and depraved, so long as they perceive it has no binding influence over its most zealous patrons?

Respecting B's. allusion to the Religious Monitor, it is only necessary to say, that we found an Association existing under a Divine constitution, which answered the purpose much better than any new one which we could induce others to assist in forming, and we hope to leave this Association, as we found it, standing on the immutable basis of Jehovah's word.

If the design of these Associations be nothing more than the procurement of means to diffuse information, why all this parade of constitutions, by-laws, officers, and agents under salary, and ministers of the gospel descending from the sacred desk to participate in the emoluments of these stations? If a political editor wishes to support some great principle of public policy, he issues his prospectus, calls upon those who think with him to sustain the cause he has espoused by contributions of the pen and the purse: and he seldom fails. But we cannot enlarge.

3. We think there is danger that these Associations will draw off the mind too much from Divine institutions, especially from the church. That they have already produced this effect, to an alarming extent, can hardly be denied. It will be seen by a reference to page 489 of the present number, that Dr. Wood appears to look with frowning aspect upon Societyism. He does not, indeed, speak very intelligibly. Probably he went as far as was deemed prudent for the meridian of New England. The Dr. evidently refers to the

influe
pular
runs
mor
cesto
1, 18
as a
volun
teer
with
not e
assoc
our
taire
rable
seen
the c
seen,
are n
them
1.
2.
3.
4.
chris
very
and
our
vers
tual
day,
whic
We
own
will
an in
W
soci
in th
flect
Peri
trut
dabl
and
thro
give

influence of these societies, as contributing to swell the tide of popular prejudice against a faithful and stated ministry, which already runs so high that it threatens to sweep away and bury, in one common vortex, all the long-cherished attainments of our reforming ancestors. The editor of the Presbyterian, in his paper of February 1, 1840, says, "voluntary societies is a misnomer, so far as it is used as a term of discrimination—*ecclesiastical* organization being as *voluntary* as any others." What does the editor mean? A volunteer is one who enters into any kind of service of his own free will, without compulsion of law, which always supposes he may or may not engage without incurring guilt. Is not this placing voluntary associations on a par with ecclesiastical? Is this the only basis of our ecclesiastical organization? If this editor is correct, then Voltaire and Hume were right; and, of all men, we are the most miserable. And, if such be the fruit of voluntary societies, we have seen enough of them. The day is, probably, not far distant, when the church will weep in bitterness over this folly. When it will be seen, with the exceptions already made, that those societies, which are now the idols of the day, so that all the world is wondering after them, are,

1. Unnecessary.
2. Inexpedient.
3. Destitute of a Divine warrant. And,
4. A peculiar and distinguishing mark of the Romish Antichrist; that the *principle* on which they are based enters into the very essence of Popery; namely, that the end justifies the means; and that their existence among us is one of the saddest evidences of our present defection from the cause of God, and the almost universal corruption of morals in the community. Indeed, this is virtually implied in B's. concluding paragraph. He "longs for the day," &c. What is the import of this? The Divine institutions which God has given us are not adequate to correct existing evils. We will invent others. And when we have accomplished by our own inventions what we could not do by Divine institutions, we will abandon the former and return again to the latter. From this an inference arises which need not be named.

We know, indeed, that many who are now involved in these associations would shudder at these results. They do not view them in the light we have done. Perhaps many have never seriously reflected either upon their warrantableness or ultimate tendency. Perhaps we are wrong; but know that we are earnestly in search of truth. These associations are already sanctioned by such a formidable array of great names, that there is a fearful odds against us; and the danger is, that men who have inadvertently fallen into them, through the influence of those to whom they look as guides, may give a verdict different from what they would in different circum-

stances. If, however, we can succeed in calling the earnest attention of thinking men towards a practical subject of no small magnitude, it is the most we can hope to accomplish in our present condition.

ART. XI.—*Queries.*

MR. EDITOR:—In the last three numbers of the Religious Monitor, an individual has attempted to prove that occasional hearing is sinful, because contrary to the word of God, and the doctrines of the Associate church. It is for others to say how clearly he has proved the doctrine, even from his own premises; and yet he may be required to show *where* this doctrine is so plainly taught in the standards of the said church, that it cannot be mistaken by the humble inquirer after truth. Few have been able to find the subject even mentioned in any of the articles of their public profession, and they maintain that the doctrines professed by a church should be so plainly exhibited, that all may read and understand them; for, when they are so obscure as to depend on inferential and feeble arguments, they will necessarily be denied by some who can neither see nor feel their force. Is, then, occasional hearing a doctrine so clearly taught by the Associate church that it is censurable, because sinful to act contrary to it in any case? Is it the door by which her members are to go in and out? Is it the *term* by which applicants are to be admitted or rejected from her communion, according as they may agree or disagree with it? Or is it a doctrine professed by some in the church and denied by others? If this be true, can they hold communion with one another while they disagree in their belief of this doctrine? Or is it as one eminent in the church, considered also in favour of the doctrine, has said, "*a disputed subject—only a bone of contention?*"

As the subject has been introduced into the Monitor, it is hoped, that, if these questions are of any importance, they will be admitted, and fairly and satisfactorily answered, that all in the same communion may enjoy equal rights and privileges, and that the church may be uniform in the belief and practice of this doctrine, which, in some places, cannot be so much as mentioned without serious consequences to her peace and prosperity. If it is a scriptural doctrine, let us fearlessly support it; if it is not, let it fall to the ground. Yours, respectfully,

QUERO.

It is not our design to answer queries addressed to a correspondent; but it is respectfully proposed to "Quero" to write an essay, proving that occasional hearing is a *duty*. In the mean time, it may not be amiss to let our readers hear the sentiments of the Christian Intelligencer, a paper devoted to the interest of the Reformed Dutch Church.

Such practices [the practices of attending, occasionally, on the ministry of heretical teachers,] cannot be indulged without both guilt and danger to the soul. The mind that relishes poison is already vitiated. He who can give the sanction of his presence and attention to those who wrest the crown of his divinity from our adored Lord, set at naught his atonement, and discard the fundamental doctrines of grace, occupies a position fearfully perilous. He belongs to the class of those who, "*after their own lusts, heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and who turn away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables.*"

In a community like this, where the human mind is subjected to so many excitements, mere *novelty*, however erratic, unhallowed, and wild, has attraction to draw away a certain cast of religionists, who are settled in nothing except the propensity to change.

But a far larger class is, to an extent greatly injurious to themselves and religion, infected with a spirit of religious gossip, are perpetually gadding about, and seem to have no ecclesiastical home. They pay no due respect to the regular order of the house of God; and were all like themselves, the Church would be dissolved. They really do nothing to sustain the privileges which they enjoy; nor do they aright cultivate the communion of saints, co-operate in Christian duties, or sympathize in the condition of Zion. They live unconnectedly. So far from adorning society, they are its blemishes; and in their own souls are unsettled, comfortless, and barren. "*These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear; clouds they are without water, carried about of winds.*"

ART. XII.—*The Secession and Relief Churches.*

A MEETING was held here on the 26th ult. of the joint Committees of the Secession and Relief Synods, on the proposed union between these two respectable bodies

of Scottish Dissenters; the Rev. Dr. Thomson, of Paisley, in the chair. The meeting was well attended, and the utmost harmony prevailed. After every one had been called upon to state their sentiments, a motion, which had been made by the Rev. Dr. Brown, Edinburgh, and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Auld, Greenock, was cordially carried, and the one or two who declined voting on the occasion, expressly declared that they had a sincere desire to promote the union, and that nothing but conscientious convictions made them differ a little from others, as to the mode or time of effecting the thing itself. The purport of the motion adopted was, that a Sub-Committee be appointed to draw out a few leading principles, as the ligaments of the proposed union, and that they be submitted to the General Committee for their consideration, and, if approved of by them, they may be submitted to the respective Synods, and thence sent down to all the Presbyteries and congregations of the bodies, that every member may carefully examine them, so that the union may be consummated in due time on good principle and in happy feeling.—*Glasgow Argus*.

The Man of Sin.—The Catholic Register draws the following parallel :

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. God is one. | 1. The Catholic Church is one. |
| 2. God is unchangeable. | 2. The Church is unchangeable. |
| 3. God excludes every other. | 3. The Church excludes every other. |
| 4. God is infallible. | 4. The Church is infallible. |
| 5. God exercises a ruling authority. | 5. The Church exercises a ruling authority. |
| 6. God subdues every intellect. | 6. The Church subdues every intellect. |
| 7. God is independent. | 7. The Church is independent. |

The writer of the above was not aware, perhaps, that in drawing this parallel he was but drawing the character of that "man of sin," the "son of perdition," of whom Paul prophesied, saying that he would sit in the temple of God, "SHOWING HIMSELF THAT HE IS GOD."

N. B. It would be well enough to remark that, in the vocabulary of papacy, the church and the pope are convertible terms.

Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence.—A pamphlet has recently been published at Albany, in opposition to an application of the Shakers to the legislature of New York, for a special grant of power in relation to their property. This pamphlet discloses some very curious particulars in relation to these singular people. It seems that the leaders, by retaining in their hands an absolute control of the property, and by pretended revelations from heaven, maintain an iron despotism over their respective communities, extending to the most trivial affairs. The people are kept in the grossest ignorance, are compelled to act as spies on each other, and if they go away can take nothing with them. Confessions are required at short intervals, which are rendered more effective by the pretence of *supernatural information*, which the system of espionage enables the elders to keep up. We give below, their "orders," which were disclosed at the legislative investigation.

"Orders"—It is

Contrary to order for any one to write the orders.

Contrary to order to inquire into the order of other families.

Contrary to order to inquire into any bargains that the deacons have made.

Contrary to order to open your mind out of the line of order.

N. B. To open your mind, is to express your grievances, or confess your sins. The line of order, is the elders of the family.

Contrary to order to expose counsel, or tell what the elders say.

Contrary to order to go to church with your sins unconfessed.

Contrary to order to receive or write a letter, without the elders' perusal of it.

Contrary to order to take a book without liberty.

Contrary to order to go out among the world, or among families, without permission of the elders.

Contrary to order to have any money privately.

The preceding orders illustrate the nature of the organization of the society: the following, frivolous and absurd as many of them are, illustrate the slavish minuteness of the supervision and control to which the members are subjected:

Contrary to order to shake hands with a world's woman without confessing it.

Contrary to order to shake hands with the world, unless they first tender the hand.

Contrary to order to play with dogs or cats.

Contrary to order for a brother and sister to ride together in a wagon, without company.

Contrary to order for a brother and sister to pass each other on the stairs.
 Contrary to order for a person to go out of the door yard, after evening meetng.
 Contrary to order to have right and left shoes.
 Contrary to order to pare the heels of shoes under.
 Contrary to order to read newspapers in dwelling-houses at any time, unless indulgence for that purpose is granted by elders.
 Contrary to order to hold the left thumb over the right in prayer, or when standing up in worship.
 Contrary to order to kneel with the left knee first.
 Contrary to order to put the left boot or shoe on first.
 Contrary to order to kneel with handkerchief in hand.
 Contrary to order to put the left foot on the stairs first, when ascending.—*Troy Whig.*

THE FRUITS OF GENUINE CHRISTIAN LOVE.—Let him that hath ingenuity, plan; and him that hath strength, labour; and him that hath money, give; and him that hath none of these, as well as him that hath all of them, bow the knee, and, with the faith of Abraham and the fervour of Elijah, pray that the kingdoms of this world may become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

To believe our neighbour immortal, and yet in our love to regard and treat him only as a mortal—to know he has a soul, and yet to feel no concern and take no care of his soul—to feed him with the bread that perisheth, and yet never offer his famishing spirit a morsel of the bread of heaven—to find him fainting with thirst, and yet give him none of the waters of life—to help him along through this brief world, and yet never seek to throw one kindly influence upon his immortal course, cannot be to love our neighbour as God has commanded.

OUR BLESSINGS MORE THAN OUR CROSSES.—Consider that our good days are generally more in number than our evil days, our days of prosperity (such, I mean, as is suitable to our condition and circumstances,) than our days of adversity. This is most certain, though most of us are apt to cast up our accounts otherwise. How many days of (at least competent) health we enjoy, for one day of grievous sickness! How many days of ease, for one of pain! How many blessings for a few crosses! For one danger that hath surprised us, how many scores of dangers have we escaped, and some of them very narrowly! But, alas! we write our mercies in the dust; but our afflictions we engrave in marble: our memory serves us too well to remember the latter, but we are strangely forgetful of the former. And this is the greatest cause of our unthankfulness, discontent, and murmuring.—*Bishop Bull.*

LOVE FERVENTLY.—Let the love of your brother be as a fire within you, consuming that selfishness which is so contrary to it, and is so natural to men; let it set your thoughts on work to study how to do others good; let your love be an active love, intense within you, and extending itself in doing good to the souls and bodies of your brethren as they need, and you are able.

It is self-love that contracts the heart, and shuts out all other love, both of God and man, save only so far as our own interest carries, and that is still self-love: but the love of God dilates the heart, purifies love, and extends it to all men; but, after a special manner, directs it to those who are more peculiarly beloved of him.—*Leighton.*

ig.

in-
nd.

Troy

ath
hat
im
am
may

ard
to
the
nor-
and
ugh
nce
God

our
our
and
ain,
How
y of
How
sur-
ome
the
rves
etful
ful-

fire
o it,
study
ense
and

love,
ries,
pu-
r, di-
ton.

CONTENTS.

	Page		Page
Quotations of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, -	457	Essay on Family Worship. No. III.	459
Farther Remarks on the Treatment of our Coloured Population, -	463	Essay on Christian Watchfulness. Part II. -	492
Symbolical Language of Scripture. No. II. -	470	Popery in Philadelphia, -	494
How may the people know when to countenance men as sent? -	477	Notice to Correspondents, -	498
Voluntary Associations, -	483	Queries.—The Secession and Relief Churches, -	502
The Minister wholly in his Work, -	487	The Man of Sin.—Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence, -	503
		Pious Sayings of Good Men, -	504

RECEIPTS BY MAIL IN FEBRUARY,

J. R. Weldin, Pittsburgh, -	\$38.00	Rev. J. Smart, Baltimore, -	\$10.00
Rev. A. Whyte, N. C., -	2.00	Wm. Dickey, Kittanning, (for 13th and 14th vol., and half of 15th,) -	5.00
George Kerr, Tuscaloosa, -	8.00	Wm. McMinn, Potter's Mills, -	5.00
Thomas Lundy, N. Y., -	5.00		

Just published, and for sale by Wm. S. Young, 173, Race St., Philadelphia, Fisher and Erskine's Explanation of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, upwards of 400 pages, duodecimo. Price, per dozen, in substantial sheep binding, eight dollars. Retail price, seventy-five cents.

Same work, on finer paper, and superior binding, 500 pages, duodecimo, eleven dollars per dozen. Retail price, one dollar.

Editors and Publishers of Religious Periodicals, who exchange with the Religious Monitor, will please copy the above, and charge the same to Wm. S. Young, who will settle with their authorized agents.

AGENTS.—In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of good standing in the Associate Church, who are requested to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

J. R. Weldin, 37 Market Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas Cummings, Putnam, Washington Co., N. Y.
James Henry, Albany, N. Y.	James Wilson, Esq., Forks of Muddy Creek, York Co., Pa.
Peter M'Arthur, Cambridge, Washington County, N. Y.	Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.
Alex. Gailey, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co. Pa.	James Hutchinson, Esq., New London Cross Roads, Chester Co., Pa.
Wm. McMinn, Potter's Mills, Centre Co., Pa.	John Smith, Pittsburgh Village, Carroll Co., Indiana.
Thomas Beveridge, D. D., Canonsburgh, Pa.	R. G. Shannon, P. M., Columbus, Randolph Co., Ill.
James Gordon, Peoria, Livingston Co., N. Y.	Col. Wm. M'Vey, Cherry Forks, Adams Co., Pa.
John Anderson, Huntingdon, Pa.	

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

The 15th volume, and some preceding volumes, can be supplied in numbers for \$1.00: bound, \$1.50.

Post Masters are respectfully requested to notify us of any discontinuance of the work sent to their office. The numbers need not be returned.

No subscription discontinued till arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

Money may be sent by mail at the risk and expense of the proprietors when five dollars or more is enclosed, provided the money is at par value in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, or Albany.

Letters and communications may be addressed either to Rev. C. Webster, 280, Pine Street, or William S. Young, 173, Race Street.

Lately published, and for sale by William S. Young, No. 173, Race Street, Philadelphia.—The TESTIMONY of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America,—printed by the direction of Synod. Price, in full sheep, three dollars per dozen: neatly half bound, two dollars and seventy-five cents. Retail; 30 cts. in sheep—45 cts. half bound.

Also, TUCKER ON PREDESTINATION; to which is appended Dr. JAMISON'S ESSAY ON DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY. Price, five dollars per dozen, and 50 cents the single copy.